arXiv:1402.2265v2 [math-ph] 11 Mar 2015

QUANTITATIVE BOUNDS ON THE DISCRETE SPECTRUM OF NON SELF-ADJOINT QUANTUM MAGNETIC HAMILTONIANS

DIOMBA SAMBOU

ABSTRACT. We use complex analysis tools to establish Lieb-Thirring type inequalities for non self-adjoint relatively compact perturbations of certain operators of mathematical physics. In the first part of the paper, we apply a main abstract result to quantum Hamiltonians of Schrödinger and Pauli with constant magnetic field of strength $b > 0$, acting in $L^2\big(\mathbb{R}^{2d}\big)$, $d \geq 1$. In the second part, the situation is rather different from the first one. We investigate the case of Pauli operator with constant magnetic field of strength $b > 0$, acting in $L^2\big(\mathbb{R}^{2d+1}\big)$, $d \geq 1$. In particular, we use our results to obtain information on the distribution of the complex eigenvalues of the perturbed operators in the neighborhood of their essential spectrum.

1. INTRODUCTION AND AN ABSTRACT RESULT

Recently, a number of results on the spectral properties of the non self-adjoint perturbations of operators of mathematical physics were obtained. We quote the articles by Frank-Laptev-Lieb-Seiringer [6], Borichev-Golinskii-Kupin [1], Demuth-Katriel-Hansmann [3], Hansmann [10], Golinskii-Kupin [9], Dubuisson [5], Pushnitskii-Raikov-Villegas-Blas [20] turned to the study of the discrete spectrum of these perturbations. The purpose of this paper is to announce and to give a brief overview of new results in this direction. The main point is that the first part of this article describes a general construction that applies to a large class of operators containing magnetic Schrödinger, Pauli and Dirac operators of full rank with constant magnetic field, hence generalizing the methods of a recent paper by the author [28].

Let $\mathscr{H}_0$ be an unbounded self-adjoint operator defined on a dense subset of $L^2(\mathbb{R}^m)$, $m \geq 1$. Suppose that the spectrum $\sigma(\mathscr{H}_0)$ of the operator is given by an infinite sequence of (real) eigenvalues of infinite multiplicity, $i.e.$

$$\begin{cases} \sigma(\mathscr{H}_0) = \sigma_{ess}(\mathscr{H}_0) = \bigcup_{j=0}^{\infty} \{\Lambda_j\}, \\ \text{where } \Lambda_0 \geq 0,\ \Lambda_{j+1} > \Lambda_j,\ |\Lambda_{j+1} - \Lambda_j| \leq \delta,\ \delta > 0 \text{ constant.} \end{cases} \tag{1.1}$$

Concrete examples of operators satisfying these assumptions are Schrödinger operators acting on $L^2\big(\mathbb{R}^{2d}, \mathbb{C}\big)$, $d \geq 1$, and Pauli operators on $L^2\big(\mathbb{R}^{2d}, \mathbb{C}^2\big)$ with constant magnetic field of strength $b > 0$, see Section 3 and Section 4, respectively. We can also consider the case of Dirac operators of full rank $\big($see [17]$\big)$, but for simplicity we will focus on the two first examples.

On the domain of the operator $\mathscr{H}_0$, we consider a (non self-adjoint) relatively compact perturbation V of $\mathscr{H}_0$, and the perturbed operator

$$\mathscr{H} = \mathscr{H}_0 + V. \tag{1.2}$$

2010 *Mathematics Subject Classification.* Primary: 35P20; Secondary: 47A75, 47A55.

Key words and phrases. Non self-adjoint relatively compact perturbations of self-adjoint operators, magnetic Schrödinger operators, magnetic Pauli operators, magnetic Dirac operators, Lieb-Thirring type inequalities.

This means that $\mathrm{dom}(\mathscr{H}_0) \subset \mathrm{dom}(V)$, and $V(\mathscr{H}_0 - \lambda)^{-1}$ is compact for $\lambda \in \rho(\mathscr{H}_0)$, the resolvent set of the operator $\mathscr{H}_0$. It is well known $\big($see e.g. [14, Chapter VI]$\big)$ that under this condition on V, there is a $\mu < 0$ such that

$$\sigma(\mathscr{H}) \subset \big\{\lambda \in \mathbb{C} :\ \Re(\lambda) \geq \mu\big\}. \tag{1.3}$$

Furthermore, we impose an additional restriction on V allowing us to control the numerical range

$$N(\mathscr{H}) := \big\{\langle \mathscr{H} f, f\rangle : f \in \mathrm{dom}\,(\mathscr{H}),\ ||f||_{L^2(\mathbb{R}^m)} = 1\big\} \tag{1.4}$$

of the operator $\mathscr{H}$ $\big($see (1.6) below$\big)$.

Recall that a compact operator L defined on a separable Hilbert space belongs to the Schatten-von Neumann class $\mathcal{S}_p, p \geq 1$, if $\|L\|_{\mathcal{S}_p} = (\mathrm{Tr}\,|L|^p)^{1/p}$ is finite. We also require that

$$V(\mathscr{H}_0 - \lambda)^{-1} \in \mathcal{S}_p, \tag{1.5}$$

for some $p \geq 1$, which is a stronger condition than just saying that the operator $V(\mathscr{H}_0 - \lambda)^{-1}$ is compact.

Since V is a relatively compact perturbation with respect to the self-adjoint operator $\mathscr{H}_0$, then the Weyl's criterion on the invariance of the essential spectrum implies that $\sigma_{ess}(\mathscr{H}) = \sigma_{ess}(\mathscr{H}_0) = \cup^{\infty}\{\Lambda_j\}$. Still, the operator $\mathscr{H}$ can have a (complex) discrete spectrum $\sigma_{disc}(\mathscr{H})$ accumulating to $\cup_{j=0}^{\infty}\{\Lambda_j\}$, see Gohberg-Goldberg-Kaashoek [7, Theorem 2.1, p. 373], and the coming theorem gives a necessary condition on its distribution. The conclusion of the theorem is written in the form of a relation which is often called a Lieb-Thirring type inequality, see Lieb-Thirring [16] for original work. In the self-adjoint case, the inequalities obtained may have important applications in the mathematical theory of the stability of the matter in presence of magnetic field, as in classical Lieb-Thirring inequalities. In the non self-adjoint case, we are not aware yet of models of mathematical physics requiring the application of our results.

Theorem 1.1. *Let $\mathscr{H}_0$ be a self-adjoint operator with $\sigma(\mathscr{H}_0) = \bigcup_{j=0}^{\infty}\big\{\Lambda_j\big\}$ as in* (1.1)*. Let $\mathscr{H} := \mathscr{H}_0 + V$ and assume that its numerical range $N(\mathscr{H})$ defined by* (1.4) *satisfies*

$$\sigma(\mathscr{H}) \subset \overline{N(\mathscr{H})} \subset \big\{\lambda \in \mathbb{C} : \Re(\lambda) \geq \mu_1\big\} \tag{1.6}$$

for some $\mu_1 < 0$. Set

$$\mu_0 = \mu_1 - 1 \tag{1.7}$$

and assume that for some $p > 1$ the perturbation V satisfies

$$\|V(\mathscr{H}_0 - \mu_0)^{-1}\|_{\mathcal{S}_p}^p \leq K_0, \tag{1.8}$$

for some constant $K_0 > 0$. Then we have

$$\sum_{\lambda \in \sigma_{disc}(\mathscr{H})} \frac{\mathrm{dist}\big(\lambda, \cup_{j=0}^{\infty}\{\Lambda_j\}\big)^p}{\big(1 + |\lambda|\big)^{2p}} \leq C_0 K_0, \tag{1.9}$$

where $C_0 = C(p, \mu_0, \Lambda_0)$ is a constant depending on p, μ_0, and Λ_0.

Corollaries.

(i) Bound (1.9) can be rewritten in a simpler manner for various subsets of $\sigma_{disc}(\mathscr{H})$. For instance, let $\tau > 0$ be fixed. Then, for λ satisfying $|\lambda| \geq \tau$, one has that

$$\frac{1}{1 + |\lambda|} = \frac{1}{|\lambda|}\frac{1}{1 + |\lambda|^{-1}} \geq \frac{1}{|\lambda|}\frac{1}{1 + \tau^{-1}}, \tag{1.10}$$

and

$$\sum_{\substack{\lambda \in \sigma_{disc}(\mathscr{H}) \\ |\lambda| \geq \tau}} \frac{\operatorname{dist}\big(\lambda, \cup_{j=0}^{\infty}\{\Lambda_j\}\big)^p}{|\lambda|^{2p}} \leq C_1 \left(1 + \frac{1}{\tau}\right)^{2p} K_0. \tag{1.11}$$

(ii) If $(\lambda_k) \subset \sigma_{disc}(\mathscr{H})$ converges to a point of $\sigma_{ess}(\mathscr{H}) = \cup_{j=0}^{\infty}\{\Lambda_j\}$, one has that

$$\sum_k \operatorname{dist}\big(\lambda_k, \cup_{j=0}^{\infty}\{\Lambda_j\}\big)^p < \infty. \tag{1.12}$$

This means that the eigenvalues from $\sigma_{disc}(\mathscr{H})$ are getting less densely distributed in a neighborhood of the Λ_j with growing p.

(iii) Similarly, we can also obtain information on diverging sequences of eigenvalues $(\lambda_k) \subset \sigma_{disc}(\mathscr{H})$. For example, if for some $\tau > 0$ the sequence (λ_k) is such that

$$\operatorname{dist}\big(\lambda_k, \cup_{j=0}^{\infty}\{\Lambda_j\}\big) \geq \tau,$$

then one has that

$$\sum_{k=1}^{\infty} \frac{1}{|\lambda_k|^{2p}} < \infty. \tag{1.13}$$

This means that the sequence must converge to infinity sufficiently fast.

Remarks.

(i) Under additional assumptions closely related to the spectral thresholds Λ_j defined by (1.1), it is proved in Sambou-[29] that $\sigma_{disc}(\mathscr{H})$ is not empty near each Λ_j. More precisely, results there in prove in particular the accumulation of the complex eigenvalues near each Λ_j.

(ii) The proof of Theorem 1.1 (see Section 2 for more details) is essentially based on a recent theorem of Hansmann [10], and a technical distortion lemma for a conformal mapping coming from complex analysis, see Lemma 2.1.

(iii) Applications of this result to magnetic Schrödinger operators on $L^2\big(\mathbb{R}^{2d}, \mathbb{C}\big)$ and magnetic Pauli operators on $L^2\big(\mathbb{R}^{2d}, \mathbb{C}^2\big)$ are given in Theorems 3.1-3.2 and Theorems 4.1-4.2 respectively. In Golinskii-Kupin [9], similar results are obtained for complex perturbations of finite band Schrödinger operators.

The paper is organized as follows. We give the proof the abstract result (Theorem 1.1) in Section 2. We apply it to magnetic $2d$-Schrödinger and $2d$-Pauli operators in Section 3 and Section 4 respectively. Sections 5, 6 and 7 are devoted to the second part of the paper. We interest to the case of magnetic $(2d+1)$-Pauli operators with constant magnetic field. Here, the essential spectrum of the operator under consideration equals $\mathbb{R}_+$, which is rather different from the case of the essential spectrum coinciding with the (discrete) set of spectral thresholds $\cup_{j=0}^{\infty}\{\Lambda_j\}$ given by (1.1). We will establish similar results to Theorem 1.1 (see Theorem 5.1) but the situation is more complicated due to the structure of the spectrum where the Landau levels play the role of thresholds. This requires the use of methods close to those from Sambou [28].

We adopt mathematical physics and spectral analysis notation and terminology from Reed-Simon [27]. As for the classes of compact operators (*i.e.* Schatten-von Neumann ideals), we refer the reader to Simon [30] and Gohberg-Goldberg-Krupnik [8]. Constants are generic, $i.e.$ changing from one relation to another. For a real x, $[x]$ denotes its integer part.

Acknowledgements. This work was initiated when the author participated in the by Franco-Ukrainian scientific cooperation programm "Dnipro 2013-14". The author is partially supported by the Chilean Program *Núcleo Científico Milenio ICM "Mathematical Theory of Quantum and Classical Magnetic Systems"*. The author is grateful to S. Kupin for valuable discussions on the subject of this article.

2. PROOF OF THE ABSTRACT RESULT

The following result of Hansmann $\big($see [10, Theorem 1]$\big)$ is the first crucial point of the proof. Let $B_0 = B_0^*$ be a bounded self-adjoint operator acting on a separable Hilbert space, and B a bounded operator satisfying $B - B_0 \in \mathcal{S}_p$, $p > 1$. Then

$$\sum_{\lambda \in \sigma_{disc}(B)} \text{dist}\big(\lambda, \sigma(B_0)\big)^p \leq C\|B - B_0\|_{\mathcal{S}_p}^p, \tag{2.1}$$

where the constant C is explicit and depends only on p. Note that we cannot apply (2.1) to the unbounded operators $\mathscr{H}_0$ and $\mathscr{H}$. To fix this, let us consider bounded resolvents

$$B_0(\mu_0) := (\mathscr{H}_0 - \mu_0)^{-1} \quad \text{and} \quad B(\mu_0) := (\mathscr{H} - \mu_0)^{-1}, \tag{2.2}$$

where μ_0 is the constant defined by (1.7). Furthermore,

$$(\mathscr{H} - \mu_0)^{-1} - (\mathscr{H}_0 - \mu_0)^{-1} = -(\mathscr{H} - \mu_0)^{-1} V (\mathscr{H}_0 - \mu)^{-1},$$

and we obtain

$$\big\|B(\mu_0) - B_0(\mu_0)\big\|_{\mathcal{S}_p}^p \leq \big\|(\mathscr{H} - \mu_0)^{-1}\big\|^p \big\|V(\mathscr{H}_0 - \mu_0)^{-1}\big\|_{\mathcal{S}_p}^p, \tag{2.3}$$

where $||\cdot||$ stays for the usual operator norm. By (1.6), we have

$$\sigma(\mathscr{H}) \subset \overline{N(\mathscr{H})} \subset \big\{\lambda \in \mathbb{C} : \ \Re(\lambda) \geq \mu_1\big\}.$$

This implies that $\text{dist}\big(\mu_0, \overline{N(\mathscr{H})}\big) \geq 1$, and using [2, Lemma 9.3.14] we get

$$\big\|(\mathscr{H} - \mu_0)^{-1}\big\| \leq \frac{1}{\text{dist}\big(\mu_0, \overline{N(\mathscr{H})}\big)} \leq 1. \tag{2.4}$$

Consequently, by (1.8), (2.3) and (2.4), we obtain

$$\big\|B(\mu_0) - B_0(\mu_0)\big\|_{\mathcal{S}_p}^p \leq K_0, \tag{2.5}$$

where K_0 is the constant defined by (1.8). Hence, we see

$$\sum_{z \in \sigma_{disc}(B(\mu_0))} \text{dist}\big(z, \sigma(B_0(\mu_0))\big)^p \leq CK_0 \tag{2.6}$$

by applying Hansmann's theorem (2.1) to the resolvents $B(\mu_0)$ and $B_0(\mu_0)$. Putting $z = \varphi_{\mu_0}(\lambda) = (\lambda - \mu_0)^{-1}$, we have by the "Spectral Mapping theorem"

$$z \in \sigma_{disc}\big(B(\mu_0)\big) \quad \Big(z \in \sigma\big(B_0(\mu_0)\big)\Big) \quad \Longleftrightarrow \quad \lambda \in \sigma_{disc}(\mathscr{H}) \quad \Big(\lambda \in \sigma(\mathscr{H}_0)\Big). \tag{2.7}$$

So, we come to a distortion lemma for the conformal map $z = \varphi_{\mu_0}(\lambda) = (\lambda - \mu_0)^{-1}$, which is the second important ingredient of the proof of the theorem.



FIGURE 2.1. *Image of the complex plane under the conformal map* φ_{μ_0}: we have **a)** $\varphi_{\mu_0}\Big(\big\{\lambda \in \mathbb{C} : \Re(\lambda) < \mu_0\big\}\Big) = \big\{z \in \mathbb{C} : \Re(z) < 0\big\}$; **b)** $\varphi_{\mu_0}\big(\text{the gray disk}\big) = \Big\{z \in \mathbb{C} : \Re(z) \geq \frac{1}{\Lambda_0-\mu_0}\Big\}$; **c)** $\varphi_{\mu_0}\Big(\big\{\mu_0 \leq \Re(\lambda) \leq \Lambda_0\big\}\Big) = \big\{z \in \mathbb{C} : \Re(z) \geq 0\big\} \cap$ outside the disk hatched; **d)** $\varphi_{\mu_0}\Big(\big\{\lambda \in \mathbb{C} : \Re(z) \geq \Lambda_0\big\}\Big) =$ the disk hatched.

Lemma 2.1. *Let μ_0 be the constant defined by* (1.7) *and Λ_j be the spectral thresholds defined by* (1.1)*. There exists a constant $C = C(\mu_0, \Lambda_0)$ depending on μ_0 and Λ_0 such that the following lower bound holds*

$$\operatorname{dist}\big(\varphi_{\mu_0}(\lambda), \varphi_{\mu_0}(\cup_{j=0}^{\infty}\{\Lambda_j\})\big) \geq \frac{C \operatorname{dist}\big(\lambda, \cup_{j=0}^{\infty}\{\Lambda_j\}\big)}{\big(1+|\lambda|\big)^2}, \quad \lambda \in \mathbb{C}. \tag{2.8}$$

The proof of the above lemma is given in Subsection 2.1. Now, combining the lemma, estimates (2.6) and (2.7), we get

$$\sum_{\lambda \in \sigma_{disc}(H)} \frac{\operatorname{dist}\big(\lambda, \cup_{j=0}^{\infty}\{\Lambda_j\}\big)^p}{\big(1+|\lambda|\big)^{2p}} \leq C_0 K_0,$$

where $C_0 = C(p, \mu_0, \Lambda_0)$ is a constant depending on p, μ_0 and Λ_0. This concludes the proof of Theorem 1.1. □

2.1. **Proof of Lemma 2.1.** The proof of the lemma follows from two preliminary lemmas and is of technical nature. The first one is as follows:

Lemma 2.2. *Let $J = [\Lambda_0, +\infty)$. There exists a constant $C = C(\mu_0, \Lambda_0)$ depending on μ_0 and Λ_0 such the following lower bound holds for any $\lambda \in \mathbb{C}$*

$$\operatorname{dist}\big(\varphi_{\mu_0}(\lambda), \varphi_{\mu_0}(J)\big) \geq \frac{C \operatorname{dist}\big(\lambda, J\big)}{\big(1+|\lambda|\big)^2}. \tag{2.9}$$

Proof. It suffices to prove that (2.9) holds for λ in each of the four sectors introduced in Figure 2.1. In what follows below, the relation $u \simeq v$ means that there exist constants c_1, c_2 such that

$$0 < c_1 \leq \frac{u}{v} \leq c_2 < \infty. \tag{2.10}$$

• For $\big\{\lambda \in \mathbb{C} : \Re(\lambda) < \mu_0\big\}$, we have $\text{dist}\big(\lambda, J\big) = |\lambda - \Lambda_0|$ and by **a)** of Figure 2.1 we have $\text{dist}\big(\varphi_{\mu_0}(\lambda), \varphi_{\mu_0}(J)\big) = |\varphi_{\mu_0}(\lambda)| = \frac{1}{|\lambda-\mu_0|}$. Consequently,

$$\frac{\text{dist}\big(\varphi_{\mu_0}(\lambda), \varphi_{\mu_0}(J)\big)}{\text{dist}\big(\lambda, I\big)} = \frac{1}{|\lambda-\mu_0||\lambda-\Lambda_0|}.$$

Thus (2.9) holds since $|\lambda - \Lambda_0| \leq C(\Lambda_0)\big(1 + |\lambda|\big)$ and $|\lambda - \mu_0| \leq C(\mu_0)\big(1 + |\lambda|\big)$.

• For $\lambda \in \Big\{\lambda \in \mathbb{C} : \Big|\lambda - \frac{\mu_0+\Lambda_0}{2}\Big| \leq \frac{\Lambda_0-\mu_0}{2}\Big\}$, we have $\text{dist}\big(\lambda, J\big) = |\lambda - \Lambda_0|$ and thanks to **b)** of Figure 2.1 we have

$$\text{dist}\big(\varphi_{\mu_0}(\lambda), \varphi_{\mu_0}(J)\big) = \Big|\varphi_{\mu_0}(\lambda) - \frac{1}{\Lambda_0 - \mu_0}\Big| = \frac{\text{dist}\big(\lambda, J\big)}{|\lambda-\mu_0||\Lambda_0-\mu_0|}.$$

Thus (2.9) holds since as above $|\lambda - \mu_0| \leq C(\mu_0)\big(1 + |\lambda|\big)$ and $|\Lambda_0 - \mu_0| = C(\mu_0, \Lambda_0)$.

• For $\lambda \in \big\{\lambda \in \mathbb{C} : \mu_0 \leq \Re(\lambda) \leq \Lambda_0\big\} \setminus \Big\{\lambda \in \mathbb{C} : \Big|\lambda - \frac{\mu_0+\Lambda_0}{2}\Big| \leq \frac{\Lambda_0-\mu_0}{2}\Big\}$, we have $\text{dist}\big(\lambda, J\big) = |\lambda - \Lambda_0|$ and **b)-c)** of Figure 2.1 imply that

$$\text{dist}\big(\varphi_{\mu_0}(\lambda), \varphi_{\mu_0}(J)\big) = \big|\Im\big(\varphi_{\mu_0}(\lambda)\big)\big| = \frac{|\Im(\lambda)|}{|\lambda-\mu_0|^2}.$$

$*$ For λ close to μ_0 in this domain, $\text{dist}\big(\lambda, J\big) \simeq$ constant and $|\Im(\lambda)| \simeq |\lambda-\mu_0|$ so that $\text{dist}\big(\varphi_{\mu_0}(\lambda), \varphi_{\mu_0}(J)\big) \simeq \frac{1}{|\lambda-\mu_0|}$. Thus (2.9) holds as above.

$*$ For λ close to Λ_0, we have $\text{dist}\big(\lambda, J\big) = |\lambda - \Lambda_0|$, $|\Im(\lambda)| \simeq |\lambda - \Lambda_0|$ and $|\lambda - \mu_0|^2 \simeq$ constant so that $\text{dist}\big(\varphi_{\mu_0}(\lambda), \varphi_{\mu_0}(J)\big) \simeq |\lambda - \Lambda_0|$. Thus (2.9) holds.

$*$ When $|\lambda| \to +\infty$, $|\Im(\lambda)| \simeq |\lambda - \Lambda_0|$ so that $\text{dist}\big(\varphi_{\mu_0}(\lambda), \varphi_{\mu_0}(J)\big) \simeq \frac{|\lambda-\Lambda_0|}{|\lambda-\mu_0|^2}$. Thus (2.9) holds as above.

• For $\lambda \in \big\{\lambda \in \mathbb{C} : \Re(\lambda) \geq \Lambda_0\big\}$, we have $\text{dist}\big(\lambda, J\big) = |\Im((\lambda)|$ and **d)** of Figure 2.1 implies that

$$\text{dist}\big(\varphi_{\mu_0}(\lambda), \varphi_{\mu_0}(J)\big) = \big|\Im\big(\varphi_{\mu}(\lambda)\big)\big| = \frac{|\Im(\lambda)|}{|\lambda-\mu_0|^2} = \frac{\text{dist}\big(\lambda, J\big)}{|\lambda-\mu_0|^2}.$$

Thus (2.9) holds as above. This concludes the proof of Lemma 2.2. □

Now for further use, let us introduce some notations. For $\Lambda_j \in \cup_{j=0}^{\infty}\{\Lambda_j\} \subset J$, define the radius $r_j := \text{dist}\big(\Lambda_j, \cup_{j=0}^{\infty}\{\Lambda_j\} \setminus \big\{\Lambda_j\big\}\big)$, $A = \bigcup_j B\big(\Lambda_j, 2r_j\big)$ and $D = \mathbb{C} \setminus A$ (see the Figure 2.2 below). Corresponding notations on the plane of $z = \varphi_{\mu_0}(\lambda)$ are $\mathcal{A}$ and $\mathcal{D}$. Namely, for $\omega \in \varphi_{\mu_0}\big(\cup_{j=0}^{\infty}\{\Lambda_j\}\big) = \Big\{\frac{1}{\Lambda_j-\mu_0}\Big\}_j$, we define the radius $r_\omega := \text{dist}\big(\omega, \varphi_{\mu_0}(\cup_{j=0}^{\infty}\{\Lambda_j\}) \setminus \{\omega\}\big)$, $\mathcal{A} = \bigcup_\omega B\big(\omega, 2r_\omega\big)$ and $\mathcal{D} = \mathbb{C} \setminus \mathcal{A}$. Note that to up to a constant factor, we have $\varphi_{\mu_0}(A) = \mathcal{A}$.

The second lemma we need goes as follows:



FIGURE 2.2. Sets $J = [\Lambda_0, +\infty)$ and $A = \bigcup_j B\big(\Lambda_j, 2r_j\big)$.

Lemma 2.3. *With the above notations, the following estimates hold:*

(i) *For any $\lambda \in D$ and any $\varphi_{\mu_0}(\lambda) \in \mathcal{D}$,*

$$\begin{aligned} &\frac{\operatorname{dist}\big(\lambda, \cup_{j=0}^{\infty}\{\Lambda_j\}\big)}{2} \le \operatorname{dist}\big(\lambda, J\big) \le \operatorname{dist}\big(\lambda, \cup_{j=0}^{\infty}\{\Lambda_j\}\big). \\ &\frac{\operatorname{dist}\big(\varphi_{\mu_0}(\lambda), \varphi_{\mu_0}(\cup_{j=0}^{\infty}\{\Lambda_j\})\big)}{2} \le \operatorname{dist}\big(\varphi_{\mu_0}(\lambda), \varphi_{\mu}(J)\big) \le \operatorname{dist}\big(\varphi_{\mu_0}(\lambda), \varphi_{\mu}(\cup_{j=0}^{\infty}\{\Lambda_j\})\big). \end{aligned} \tag{2.11}$$

(ii) *For any $\lambda \in A$,*

$$\operatorname{dist}\big(\varphi_{\mu_0}(\lambda), \varphi_{\mu_0}(\cup_{j=0}^{\infty}\{\Lambda_j\})\big) \ge \frac{C \operatorname{dist}\big(\lambda, \cup_{j=0}^{\infty}\{\Lambda_j\}\big)}{\big(1+|\lambda|\big)^2}, \tag{2.12}$$

where $C = C(\mu_0)$ is a constant depending on μ_0.

Proof. **(i)** We prove only the first estimate in (2.11). The second can be treated similarly. Obviously $\operatorname{dist}\big(\lambda, J\big) \le \operatorname{dist}\big(\lambda, \cup_{j=0}^{\infty}\{\Lambda_j\}\big)$. For $\lambda \in D$, let $\Lambda_j \in \cup_{j=0}^{\infty}\{\Lambda_j\}$ such that

$$\operatorname{dist}\big(\lambda, \cup_{j=0}^{\infty}\{\Lambda_j\}\big) = |\lambda - \Lambda_j| \ge 2r_j \quad \left(\Longleftrightarrow \frac{\operatorname{dist}\big(\lambda, \cup_{j=0}^{\infty}\{\Lambda_j\}\big)}{2} \ge r_j\right). \tag{2.13}$$

Since $\operatorname{dist}\big(\lambda, \cup_{j=0}^{\infty}\{\Lambda_j\}\big) \le \operatorname{dist}\big(\lambda, J\big) + r_j$, *i.e.* $\operatorname{dist}\big(\lambda, \cup_{j=0}^{\infty}\{\Lambda_j\}\big) - r_j \le \operatorname{dist}\big(\lambda, J\big)$, then (2.13) implies that $\operatorname{dist}\big(\lambda, \cup_{j=0}^{\infty}\{\Lambda_j\}\big) - \frac{\operatorname{dist}\big(\lambda, \cup_{j=0}^{\infty}\{\Lambda_j\}\big)}{2} \le \operatorname{dist}\big(\lambda, J\big)$. That means

$$\frac{\operatorname{dist}\big(\lambda, \cup_{j=0}^{\infty}\{\Lambda_j\}\big)}{2} \le \operatorname{dist}\big(\lambda, J\big).$$

(ii) Obviously all points $\lambda \in A$ are satisfy $|\Im(\lambda)| \le 2r_j$ and $\Lambda_j \le \Re(\lambda) \le \Lambda_{j+1}$ for some $\Lambda_j \in \cup_{j=0}^{\infty}\{\Lambda_j\}$ such that $\operatorname{dist}\big(\lambda, \cup_{j=0}^{\infty}\{\Lambda_j\}\big) = |\lambda - \Lambda_j|$ $\big($or $\operatorname{dist}\big(\lambda, \cup_{j=0}^{\infty}\{\Lambda_j\}\big) = |\lambda - \Lambda_{j+1}|\big)$. For $\operatorname{dist}\big(\lambda, \cup_{j=0}^{\infty}\{\Lambda_j\}\big) = |\lambda - \Lambda_j|$, we have

$$\operatorname{dist}\big(\varphi_{\mu_0}(\lambda), \varphi_{\mu}(\cup_{j=0}^{\infty}\{\Lambda_j\})\big) = \Big|\frac{1}{\lambda - \mu_0} - \frac{1}{\Lambda_j - \mu_0}\Big| = \frac{\operatorname{dist}\big(\lambda, \cup_{j=0}^{\infty}\{\Lambda_j\}\big)}{|\lambda - \mu_0||\Lambda_j - \mu_0|}.$$

Then (2.12) holds since $|\lambda - \mu_0| \le C(\mu_0)\big(1 + |\lambda|\big)$ and $|\Lambda_j - \mu_0| \le 2|\lambda - \mu_0|$ for $\Re(\lambda) > \Lambda_0$. This completes the proof. □

We get immediately Lemma 2.1 by combining Lemma 2.2 and Lemma 2.3. □

3. Application of Theorem 1.1 to perturbations of the magnetic $2d$-Schrödinger operators, $d \geq 1$

3.1. **Definition of the operators.** Let $X_\perp := (x_1, y_1, \ldots, x_d, y_d) \in \mathbb{R}^{2d}$, $d \geq 1$ and $b > 0$ be a constant. We consider

$$H_0 := \sum_{j=0}^{d} \left\{ \left(D_{x_j} + \frac{1}{2} b y_j \right)^2 + \left(D_{y_j} - \frac{1}{2} b x_j \right)^2 \right\}, \tag{3.1}$$

the Schrödinger operator acting on $L^2\big(\mathbb{R}^{2d}\big) := L^2\big(\mathbb{R}^{2d}, \mathbb{C}\big)$ with constant magnetic field of strength $b > 0$. The self-adjoint operator H_0 is originally defined on $C_0^\infty\big(\mathbb{R}^{2d}\big)$, and then closed in $L^2\big(\mathbb{R}^{2d}\big)$. It is well known $\big($see e.g. [4]$\big)$ that its spectrum consists of the increasing sequence of Landau levels

$$\Lambda_j = b(d + 2j), \quad j \in \mathbb{N}, \tag{3.2}$$

and the multiplicity of each eigenvalue Λ_j is infinite.

As in (1.2), define the perturbed operator

$$H = H_0 + V, \tag{3.3}$$

where we identify the non self-adjoint perturbation V with the multiplication by the function $V : \mathbb{R}^{2d} \to \mathbb{C}$.

Most of the known results on the discrete spectrum of Schrödinger operators deal with self-adjoint perturbations V and study its asymptotic behaviour at the edges of its essential spectrum. For V admitting power-like or slower decay at infinity, see [11, Chap. 11-12], [20], [22], [23], [31], [32], and for potentials V decaying at infinity exponentially fast or having a compact support see [26]. For Landau Hamiltonians in exterior domains see [13], [18] and [21].

In [28], the perturbed operator H defined by (3.3) is studied under the restriction that the perturbation V may be bounded. In the present paper, we show that results there in concerning the operator H are direct applications of Theorem 1.1 and its corollaries (see Subsection 3.3).

3.2. **Unbounded non self-adjoint electric potentials.** According to (1.6), we consider the class of non self-adjoint electric potentials V satisfying

$$\big(\Re(V) f, f\big) \geq \mu_1 \|f\|^2 \tag{3.4}$$

for some $\mu_1 < 0$, and the following estimate

$$|V(X_\perp)| \leq C F(X_\perp), \quad F \in L^p\big(\mathbb{R}^{2d}\big), \quad p \geq 2, \tag{3.5}$$

where $C > 0$ is a constant and F is a positive function.

The definition of the numerical range (1.4) implies that $\sigma(\mathscr{H}) \subset \overline{N(\mathscr{H})} \subset \{\lambda \in \mathbb{C} : \Re(\lambda) \geq \mu_1\}$. Under these assumptions on V, condition (1.5) according to (1.8) is in fact naturally satisfied for any $\lambda \in \rho(H_0)$ by the following lemma:

Lemma 3.1. [28, Lemma 6.1] *Let Λ_j be the Landau levels defined by* (3.2) *and $\lambda \in \mathbb{C} \setminus \cup_{j=0}^{\infty}\{\Lambda_j\}$. Assume that $F \in L^p\big(\mathbb{R}^{2d}\big)$, $d \geq 1$ with $p \geq 2\big[\frac{d}{2}\big] + 2$. There exists a constant $C = C(p, b, d)$ such that*

$$\big\|F(H_0 - \lambda)^{-1}\big\|_{\mathcal{S}_p}^p \leq \frac{C(1 + |\lambda|)^d}{\operatorname{dist}\big(\lambda, \cup_{j=0}^{\infty}\{\Lambda_j\}\big)^p} \int_{\mathbb{R}^{2d}} |F(X_\perp)|^p dX_\perp. \tag{3.6}$$

Theorem 3.1 below is an immediate consequence of Lemma 3.1 and Theorem 1.1 with $\mathscr{H}_0 = H_0$, $\mathscr{H} = H$ and $m = 2d$.

Theorem 3.1. *Let $H = H_0 + V$ be the perturbed Schrödinger operator defined by* (3.3) *with V satisfying conditions* (3.4) *and* (3.5)*. Assume that $F \in L^p\big(\mathbb{R}^{2d}\big)$, $d \geq 1$ with $p \geq 2\big[\frac{d}{2}\big] + 2$. We have*

$$\sum_{\lambda \in \sigma_{disc}(H)} \frac{\mathrm{dist}\big(\lambda, \cup_{j=0}^{\infty}\{\Lambda_j\}\big)^p}{\big(1+|\lambda|\big)^{2p}} \leq C_1 \int_{\mathbb{R}^{2d}} |F(X_\perp)|^p dX_\perp, \tag{3.7}$$

where the constant $C_1 = C(p, \mu_0, b, d)$ depends on p, $\mu_0 := \mu_1 - 1$, b and d.

Proof. It suffices to show that (1.8) happens with $K_0 = C_1 \int_{\mathbb{R}^{2d}} |F(X_\perp)|^p dX_\perp$, where C_1 is the constant defined by (3.7). According to assumption (3.4) on V, the choice of μ_0 defined by (1.7) implies that

$$\mathrm{dist}\big(\mu_0, \cup_{j=0}^{\infty}\{\Lambda_j\}\big) \geq 1.$$

Otherwise, if V satisfies assumption (3.5), then there exists a bounded operator $\mathcal{V}$ such that for any $X_\perp \in \mathbb{R}^{2d}$, $V(X_\perp) = \mathcal{V}F(X_\perp)$. Thus with the help of Lemma 3.1, we conclude in particular that

$$\big\|V(H_0 - \mu_0)^{-1}\big\|_p^p \leq C(p, \mu_0, b, d) \int_{\mathbb{R}^{2d}} |F(X_\perp)|^p dX_\perp.$$

Now, Theorem 3.1 follows immediately using Theorem 1.1. □

Since for any $\tau > 0$ with $|\lambda| \geq \tau$ estimate (1.10) holds, then we get the following corollary:

Corollary 3.1. *Under the assumptions and the notations of Theorem 3.1, we have the following bound for any $\tau > 0$*

$$\sum_{\substack{\lambda \in \sigma_{disc}(H) \\ |\lambda| \geq \tau}} \frac{\mathrm{dist}\big(\lambda, \cup_{j=0}^{\infty}\{\Lambda_j\}\big)^p}{|\lambda|^{2p}} \leq C_1 \left(1 + \frac{1}{\tau}\right)^{2p} \int_{\mathbb{R}^{2d}} |F(X_\perp)|^p dX_\perp. \tag{3.8}$$

It goes without saying that we can derive relations similar to (1.12)-(5.14) in the present situation. Namely, informations about sequences of complex eigenvalues converging to the Landau levels.

3.3. **About the results in** [28, Theorem 2.2]**.** Let us now consider the class of bounded non self-adjoint electric potentials V. In this case, it can be easily checked that condition (3.4), then condition (1.6) are satisfied with $\mu_1 = -\|V\|_\infty$. More precisely we have

$$\sigma(H) \subset \overline{N(H)} \subset \big\{\lambda \in \mathbb{C} : \ \Re(\lambda) \geq -\|V\|_\infty \ \text{ and } \ |\Im(\lambda)| \leq \|V\|_\infty\big\}. \tag{3.9}$$

So as in Theorem 3.1, we get the following result:

Theorem 3.2. [28, Theorem 2.2] *Let $H = H_0 + V$ be the perturbed Schrödinger operator defined by* (3.3) *with V bounded and satisfying condition* (3.5)*. Assume that $F \in L^p\big(\mathbb{R}^{2d}\big)$, $d \geq 1$ with $p \geq 2\big[\frac{d}{2}\big] + 2$. Then the following holds*

$$\sum_{\lambda \in \sigma_{disc}(H)} \frac{\mathrm{dist}\big(\lambda, \cup_{j=0}^{\infty}\{\Lambda_j\}\big)^p}{\big(1+|\lambda|\big)^{2p}} \leq C_2\big(1 + \|V\|_\infty\big)^{2p} \int_{\mathbb{R}^{2d}} |F(X_\perp)|^p dX_\perp, \tag{3.10}$$

where Λ_j are the Landau levels defined by (3.2)*, and $C_2 = C(p, b, d)$ is a constant depending on p, b and d.*

In the spirit of Corollary 3.1, we get the following inequality:

Corollary 3.2. [28, Corollary 2.2] *Under the assumptions and the notations of Theorem* 3.2*, we have the following bound for any* $\tau > 0$

$$\sum_{\substack{\lambda \in \sigma_{disc}(H) \\ |\lambda| \geq \tau}} \frac{\operatorname{dist}\big(\lambda, \cup_{j=0}^{\infty}\{\Lambda_j\}\big)^p}{|\lambda|^{2p}} \leq C_2 \left(1 + \frac{1}{\tau}\right)^{2p} \big(1 + \|V\|_{\infty}\big)^{2p} \int_{\mathbb{R}^{2d}} |F(X_{\perp})|^p dX_{\perp}. \tag{3.11}$$

Remarks.

(i) Theorem 3.2 is an immediate corollary of the general abstract result Theorem 1.1.

(ii) It seems appropriate to mention that the assumptions of Theorem 3.2 are typically satisfied by the potentials $V : \mathbb{R}^{2d} \to \mathbb{C}$ such that

$$|V(X_{\perp})| \leq C \langle X_{\perp} \rangle^{-m}, \quad m > 0, \quad pm > 2d, \quad p \geq 2, \tag{3.12}$$

where $C > 0$ is a constant and $\langle y \rangle := \big(1 + |y|^2\big)^{1/2}$, $y \in \mathbb{R}^n$, $n \geq 1$.

(iii) Certain examples showing the sharpness of our results in the two-dimensional case are discussed in [28, Subsection 2.2].

4. Application of Theorem 1.1 to perturbations of the magnetic $2d$-Pauli operators, $d \geq 1$

4.1. **Definition of the operators.** To simplify, we consider the two-dimensional Pauli operator acting in $L^2(\mathbb{R}^2) := L^2(\mathbb{R}^2, \mathbb{C}^2)$. The general situation can be treated in a similar manner (see the remarks just after Corollary 4.1). The self-adjoint unperturbed Pauli operator H_0 given by

$$H_0 := \begin{pmatrix} (-i\nabla - \mathbf{A})^2 - b & 0 \\ 0 & (-i\nabla - \mathbf{A})^2 + b \end{pmatrix} =: \begin{pmatrix} H_1 & 0 \\ 0 & H_2 \end{pmatrix}, \tag{4.1}$$

is defined originally on $C_0^{\infty}(\mathbb{R}^2)$ and then closed in $L^2(\mathbb{R}^2)$. Here $\mathbf{A} = (A_1, A_2) : \mathbb{R}^2 \to \mathbb{R}^2$ is the magnetic potential, and $b(X_{\perp}) := \frac{\partial A_2}{\partial x} - \frac{\partial A_1}{\partial y}$, $X_{\perp} = (x, y) \in \mathbb{R}^2$ is the magnetic field. We focus on the case where $b > 0$ is a constant. In this case, the spectrum $\sigma(H_0)$ of the Pauli operator H_0 $\big($see e.g [4]$\big)$ is given by

$$\sigma(H_0) = \bigcup_{j=0}^{\infty} \{\Lambda_j\}, \quad \Lambda_j = 2bj. \tag{4.2}$$

Now consider the matrix-valued electric potential

$$V(X_{\perp}) := \begin{pmatrix} v_{11}(X_{\perp}) & v_{12}(X_{\perp}) \\ v_{21}(X_{\perp}) & v_{22}(X_{\perp}) \end{pmatrix}, \quad X_{\perp} = (x, y) \in \mathbb{R}^2, \tag{4.3}$$

and introduce the perturbed operator

$$H = H_0 + V, \tag{4.4}$$

where we identify the potential V with the multiplication operator by the matrix-valued function V.

To our best knowledge, there is no result on non self-adjoint magnetic Pauli operators. As in the case of magnetic Schrödinger operators, most of known results on the discrete spectrum of Pauli operators deal with self-adjoint perturbations V $\big($see e.g. [12], [24], [25]$\big)$.

4.2. **Unbounded non self-adjoint matrix electric potentials.** According to (1.6) and as in (3.4), let us consider the class of non self-adjoint electric potentials V satisfying (4.3) and

$$\big(\Re(V)f, f\big) \geq \mu_1 \|f\|^2, \tag{4.5}$$

together with the following estimate

$$|v_{\ell k}(\mathbf{x})| \leq CF(\mathbf{x}), \quad 1 \leq \ell, k \leq 2, \quad F \in L^p\big(\mathbb{R}^{2d}\big), \quad p \geq 2, \tag{4.6}$$

where $C > 0$ is a constant and F a positive function.

Remarks.

(i) Note that if the potential V is diagonal, *i.e.* $v_{12} = v_{21} = 0$, then assumption (4.5) is satisfied trivially if $\Re(v_{11}) \geq \mu_1$ and $\Re(v_{22}) \geq \mu_1$.

(ii) In the case where V is non-diagonal with $\Re(v_{\ell k}) \geq \omega_0$ for some $\omega_0 < 0$, it can be verified that assumption (4.5) holds with $\mu_1 = -2|\omega_0|$.

We have the following lemma giving a quantitative bound on the norm $||V(H_0 - \lambda)^{-1}||_{\mathcal{S}_p}$ in terms of the L^p-norm of F.

Lemma 4.1. *Let $d = 1$ and Λ_j be the Landau levels defined by* (4.2)*. Consider $\lambda \in \mathbb{C} \setminus \cup_{j=0}^{\infty}\{\Lambda_j\}$ and assume that $F \in L^p\big(\mathbb{R}^2\big)$ with $p \geq 2$. There exists a constant $C = C(p, b)$ such that*

$$\big\|F(H_0 - \lambda)^{-1}\big\|_{\mathcal{S}_p}^p \leq \frac{C(1 + |\lambda|)}{\operatorname{dist}\big(\lambda, \cup_{j=0}^{\infty}\{\Lambda_j\}\big)^p} \int_{\mathbb{R}^{2d}} |F(X_\perp)|^p dX_\perp. \tag{4.7}$$

Proof. Let H_ℓ, $\ell = 1, 2$ be the magnetic Schrödinger operators defined by (4.1). Obviously, for any λ in the resolvent set of H_0, we have

$$(H_0 - \lambda)^{-1} = \begin{pmatrix} (H_1 - \lambda)^{-1} & 0 \\ 0 & (H_2 - \lambda)^{-1} \end{pmatrix}. \tag{4.8}$$

Thus if p_j is the orthogonal projection onto $\ker(H_\ell - \Lambda_j)$ for $\ell = 1, 2$, then we have

$$(H_1 - \lambda)^{-1} = \sum_{j \in \mathbb{N}} (\Lambda_j - \lambda)^{-1} p_j \quad \text{and} \quad (H_2 - \lambda)^{-1} = \sum_{j \in \mathbb{N}^*} (\Lambda_j - \lambda)^{-1} p_{j-1}. \tag{4.9}$$

Since H_ℓ, $\ell = 1, 2$ are magnetic Schrödinger operators, then Lemma 3.1 can be applied with $d = 1$ to get that for any $p \geq 2$, the p-Schatten norm of the weighted resolvent $F(H_\ell - \lambda)^{-1}$ satisfies the estimate

$$\big\|F(H_\ell - \lambda)^{-1}\big\|_{\mathcal{S}_p}^p \leq \frac{C\big(1 + |\lambda|\big)}{\operatorname{dist}\big(\lambda, \cup_{j=0}^{\infty}\{\Lambda_j\}\big)^p} \int_{\mathbb{R}^{2d}} |F(X_\perp)|^p dX_\perp, \quad \ell = 1, 2.$$

This implies the lemma and concludes the proof. □

Setting $\mathscr{H}_0 = H_0$, $\mathscr{H} = H$, $m = 2d = 2$ and recalling Theorem 1.1 readily yields the following result.

Theorem 4.1. *Let $H = H_0 + V$ be the perturbed Pauli operator defined by* (4.4) *with V satisfying* (4.5) *and* (4.6)*. Assume that $F \in L^p\big(\mathbb{R}^2\big)$ with $p \geq 2$. Then the following bound holds true*

$$\sum_{\lambda \in \sigma_{disc}(H)} \frac{\operatorname{dist}\big(\lambda, \cup_{j=0}^{\infty}\{\Lambda_j\}\big)^p}{\big(1 + |\lambda|\big)^{2p}} \leq C_3 \int_{\mathbb{R}^{2d}} |F(X_\perp)|^p dX_\perp, \tag{4.10}$$

where the constant $C_3 = C(p, \mu_0, b)$ depends on p, $\mu_0 := \mu_1 - 1$, and b.

Proof. Follows as in the proof of Theorem 3.1 with $K_0 = C_2 \int_{\mathbb{R}^{2d}} |F(X_\perp)|^p dX_\perp$. □

Since for any $\tau > 0$ with $|\lambda| \geq \tau$ estimate (1.10) holds, then we get the following corollary:

Corollary 4.1. *Under the assumptions and the notations of Theorem 4.1, we have the following bound for any $\tau > 0$*

$$\sum_{\substack{\lambda \in \sigma_{disc}(H) \\ |\lambda| \geq \tau}} \frac{\operatorname{dist}\big(\lambda, \cup_{j=0}^{\infty}\{\Lambda_j\}\big)^p}{|\lambda|^{2p}} \leq C_3 \left(1 + \frac{1}{\tau}\right)^{2p} \int_{\mathbb{R}^{2d}} |F(X_\perp)|^p dX_\perp. \tag{4.11}$$

Remarks.

(i) Theorem 4.1 (then Corollary 4.1) remains valid if we replace the two-dimensional Pauli operator H_0 by the general $2d$-Pauli operators acting on $L^2\big(\mathbb{R}^{2d}, \mathbb{C}^2\big)$, $d \geq 1$, defined by

$$H_0 := \begin{pmatrix} \mathbb{H}_{0,\perp} - bd & 0 \\ 0 & \mathbb{H}_{0,\perp} + bd \end{pmatrix} =: \begin{pmatrix} \mathbb{H}_{0,\perp}^- & 0 \\ 0 & \mathbb{H}_{0,\perp}^+ \end{pmatrix}, \tag{4.12}$$

where

$$\mathbb{H}_{0,\perp} := \sum_{j=0}^{d} \left\{ \left(D_{x_j} + \frac{1}{2} b y_j\right)^2 + \left(D_{y_j} - \frac{1}{2} b x_j\right)^2 \right\} \tag{4.13}$$

is the $2d$-Schrödinger operator defined by (3.1). In this case, the set of Landau levels is given by $\cup_{j=0}^{\infty}\{\Lambda_j\}$ with $\Lambda_j = 2bdj$, $j \in \mathbb{N}$, and we require that $F \in L^p\big(\mathbb{R}^{2d}\big)$ with $p \geq 2\big[\frac{d}{2}\big] + 2$.

(ii) Theorem 4.1 and Corollary 4.1 implies immediate corollaries on the distribution of sequences of complex eigenvalues near the Landau levels of the magnetic Pauli operators following relations similar to (1.12)-(5.14).

4.3. **Bounded non self-adjoint matrix electric potentials.** Let us now consider the class of bounded non-selfadjoint electric matrix potentials V satisfying assumption (4.6). Consequently, (4.5) and then condition (1.6) are satisfied with $\mu_1 = -2\|V\|_\infty$. More precisely we have

$$\sigma(H) \subset \overline{N(H)} \subset \big\{\lambda \in \mathbb{C} : \ \Re(\lambda) \geq -2\|V\|_\infty \ \text{ and } \ |\Im(\lambda)| \leq 2\|V\|_\infty\big\}. \tag{4.14}$$

Since the matrix electric potential V is bounded, then μ_0 can be eliminated in the constant $C_3 = C(p, \mu_0, b, d)$ appearing in Theorem 4.1 with the additional factor $\big(1 + \|V\|_\infty\big)^{2p}$ to pay in counterpart in the right side hand of (4.10).

This yields to the following result:

Theorem 4.2. *Let $H = H_0 + V$ be the perturbed Pauli operator defined by* (4.4) *with V bounded and satisfying* (4.6)*. Assume that $F \in L^p\big(\mathbb{R}^2\big)$ with $p \geq 2$. Then the following holds:*

$$\sum_{\lambda \in \sigma_{disc}(H)} \frac{\operatorname{dist}\big(\lambda, \cup_{j=0}^{\infty}\{\Lambda_j\}\big)^p}{\big(1 + |\lambda|\big)^{2p}} \leq C_4 \big(1 + \|V\|_\infty\big)^{2p} \int_{\mathbb{R}^{2d}} |F(X_\perp)|^p dX_\perp, \tag{4.15}$$

where $C_4 = C(p, b, d)$ is a constant depending on p, b and d.

In the spirit of Corollary 4.1, we have the following corollary:

Corollary 4.2. *Under the assumptions and the notations of theorem* 4.2*, we have the following bound for any* $\tau > 0$

$$\sum_{\substack{\lambda \in \sigma_{disc}(H) \\ |\lambda| \geq \tau}} \frac{\operatorname{dist}\big(\lambda, \cup_{j=0}^{\infty}\{\Lambda_j\}\big)^p}{|\lambda|^{2p}} \leq C_4 \left(1 + \frac{1}{\tau}\right)^{2p} \big(1 + \|V\|_\infty\big)^{2p} \int_{\mathbb{R}^{2d}} |F(X_\perp)|^p dX_\perp. \tag{4.16}$$

5. Lieb-Thirring type inequalities for magnetic $(2d+1)$-Pauli operators, $d \geq 1$

From this section, we interest now to the second part of this paper. Here, the essential spectrum of the operator under consideration is continuous and the Landau levels will play the role of thresholds of this spectrum, which is rather different from the case of the operators studied the first part. We will prove similar results, but due to the structure of the spectrum the situation is more complicated.

5.1. **Definition of the operators.** Let $\mathbb{P}_0$ be the $(2d+1)$-dimensional self-adjoint Pauli operators with constant magnetic field, acting on $L^2\big(\mathbb{R}^{2d+1}\big) := L^2\big(\mathbb{R}^{2d+1}, \mathbb{C}^2\big)$, $d \geq 1$, defined by

$$\mathbb{P}_0 := \begin{pmatrix} \mathbb{H}_0 - bd & 0 \\ 0 & \mathbb{H}_0 + bd \end{pmatrix} =: \begin{pmatrix} \mathbb{P}_1 & 0 \\ 0 & \mathbb{P}_2 \end{pmatrix}. \tag{5.1}$$

The constant $b > 0$ is the strength of the magnetic field and for the cartesian coordinates $\mathbf{x} := (x_1, y_1, \ldots, x_d, y_d, x) \in \mathbb{R}^{2d+1}$,

$$\mathbb{H}_0 := \sum_{j=0}^{d} \left\{ \left(D_{x_j} + \frac{1}{2} b y_j\right)^2 + \left(D_{y_j} - \frac{1}{2} b x_j\right)^2 \right\} + D_x^2, \qquad D_\nu := -i\frac{\partial}{\partial \nu} \tag{5.2}$$

is the $(2d+1)$-self-adjoint Schrödinger operator with constant magnetic field originally defined on $C_0^\infty\big(\mathbb{R}^{2d+1}, \mathbb{C}\big)$. It is well known $\big($see e.g [4]$\big)$ that the spectrum of the operator $\mathbb{P}_0$ is absolutely continuous, coincides with $[0, +\infty)$ and has an infinite set of Landau levels

$$\Lambda_j = 2bdj, \quad j \in \mathbb{N}, \tag{5.3}$$

playing the role of thresholds of this spectrum.

We introduce the perturbed operator on the domain of the operator $\mathbb{P}_0$

$$\mathbb{P} = \mathbb{P}_0 + V, \tag{5.4}$$

where we identify the perturbation V with the multiplication operator by the matrix-valued function

$$V(\mathbf{x}) := \begin{pmatrix} v_{11}(\mathbf{x}) & v_{12}(\mathbf{x}) \\ v_{21}(\mathbf{x}) & v_{22}(\mathbf{x}) \end{pmatrix}, \quad \mathbf{x} \in \mathbb{R}^{2d+1}. \tag{5.5}$$

5.2. **Assumptions on the potential V.** The electric potential V is assumed to be of the form (5.5) and to be a bounded non self-adjoint perturbation such that for any $1 \leq \ell, k \leq 2$,

$$|v_{\ell k}(\mathbf{x})| \leq C F(\mathbf{x}) G(x), \quad \mathbf{x} \in \mathbb{R}^{2d+1}, \tag{5.6}$$

where $C > 0$ is a constant, F and G are two positive functions satisfying $F \in L^p(\mathbb{R}^{2d+1})$ for $p \geq 2$, and $G \in L^2(\mathbb{R})$.

Remarks.

(i) If we set $x_\perp := (x_1, y_1, \ldots, x_d, y_d) \in \mathbb{R}^{2d}$, then it can be easily checked that assumption (5.6) is satisfied by matrix electric potentials $V : \mathbb{R}^{2d+1} \to \mathbb{C}^2$ satisfying the estimate

$$|V(\mathbf{x})| \leq C \langle x_\perp \rangle^{-m_\perp} \langle x \rangle^{-m}, \quad m_\perp > 0, \quad m > 1/2, \tag{5.7}$$

where $\langle y\rangle := \big(1+|y|^2\big)^{1/2}$, $y\in\mathbb{R}^n$, $n\geq 1$.

(ii) We can also consider matrix electric potentials $V:\mathbb{R}^{2d+1}\to\mathbb{C}^2$ verifying

$$|V(\mathbf{x})|\leq C\,\langle\mathbf{x}\rangle^{-\alpha},\quad \alpha>1/2. \tag{5.8}$$

5.3. **Results.** Under assumption (5.6) on V, we obtain (see Lemma 6.1 below) that for any $\lambda\in\rho(\mathbb{P}_0)$, $\|F(\mathbb{P}_0-\lambda)^{-1}G\|_{\mathcal{S}_p}<\infty$. Once again, this implies that V is a relatively compact perturbation. Then the Weyl's criterion on the invariance of the essential spectrum implies that $\sigma_{ess}(\mathbb{P})=\sigma_{ess}(\mathbb{P}_0)=[0,+\infty)$. However, the operator $\mathbb{P}$ can have a (complex) discrete spectrum $\sigma_{disc}(\mathbb{P})$ accumulating to $[0,+\infty)$, see Gohberg-Goldberg-Kaashoek [7, Theorem 2.1, p. 373]. The coming theorem gives a necessary condition on its distribution in particular near the spectral thresholds of this spectrum, the Landau levels.

As usual, $[x]$ denotes the integer part of $x\in\mathbb{R}$, and $x_+:=\max(x,0)$.

Theorem 5.1. *Let $\mathbb{P}=\mathbb{P}_0+V$ with V bounded satisfying* (5.5) *and* (5.6). *Assume that $F\in L^p\big(\mathbb{R}^{2d+1}\big)$ with $p\geq 2\big[\frac{d}{2}\big]+2$, $d\geq 1$ and $G\in L^2\big(\mathbb{R}\big)$. Introduce the constant*

$$K:=\big(\|G\|_{L^2}+\|G\|_{L^\infty}\big)^p\big(1+\|V\|_\infty\big)^{d+\frac{p}{2}+\frac{3}{2}+\varepsilon}\int_{\mathbb{R}^{2d+1}}|F(\mathbf{x})|^p d\mathbf{x} \tag{5.9}$$

with $0<\varepsilon<1$. Then we have

$$\sum_{\lambda\,\in\,\sigma_{disc}(\mathbb{P})}\frac{\mathrm{dist}\big(\lambda,[0,+\infty)\big)^{\frac{p}{2}+1+\varepsilon}\,\mathrm{dist}\big(\lambda,\cup_{j=0}^{\infty}\{\Lambda_j\}\big)^{(\frac{p}{4}-1+\varepsilon)_+}}{(1+|\lambda|)^\gamma}\leq C_5K, \tag{5.10}$$

where Λ_j are the Landau levels defined by (5.3), *$\gamma>d+\frac{3}{2}$ and $C_5=C(p,b,d,\varepsilon)$ is a constant depending on p, b, d and ε.*

Corollaries.

(i) Bound (5.10) can be rewritten in a simpler manner for various subsets of $\sigma_{disc}(\mathbb{P})$. For instance, let $\tau>0$ be fixed. Then, for λ satisfying $|\lambda|\geq\tau$, one has that

$$\frac{1}{1+|\lambda|}=\frac{1}{|\lambda|}\frac{1}{1+|\lambda|^{-1}}\geq\frac{1}{|\lambda|}\frac{1}{1+\tau^{-1}},$$

and

$$\sum_{\substack{\lambda\,\in\,\sigma_{disc}(\mathbb{P})\\ |\lambda|\,\geq\,\tau}}\frac{\mathrm{dist}\big(\lambda,[0,+\infty)\big)^{\frac{p}{2}+1+\varepsilon}\,\mathrm{dist}\big(\lambda,\cup_{j=0}^{\infty}\{\Lambda_j\}\big)^{(\frac{p}{4}-1+\varepsilon)_+}}{|\lambda|^\gamma}\leq C_5\left(1+\frac{1}{\tau}\right)^\gamma K. \tag{5.11}$$

(ii) If we assume that $(\lambda_k)\subset\sigma_{disc}(\mathbb{P})$ converges to a point of some $\lambda^*\in\sigma_{ess}(\mathbb{P})=[\Lambda_0,+\infty)$, then without any loss of generality, we can consider a subsequence and suppose that it satisfies one of the following conditions:

a) $\lambda^*\in[\Lambda_0,+\infty)\setminus\cup_{j=0}^{\infty}\{\Lambda_j\}$,

b) $\lambda^*\in\cup_{j=0}^{\infty}\{\Lambda_j\}$.

Under condition **a)**, because the sequence $\big(\mathrm{dist}(\lambda_k,\cup_{j=0}^{\infty}\{\Lambda_j\})\big)$ is positive and does not converge to zero, then we deduce from the bound (5.10) that

$$\sum_k|\Im(\lambda_k)|^{\frac{p}{2}+1+\varepsilon}<\infty. \tag{5.12}$$

Under condition **b)**, if we suppose moreover that λ_k tends to a Landau level non-tangentially $\big(i.e.\ |\Re(\lambda_k)-\lambda^*| \leq C\,|\Im(\lambda_k)|$ with some $C>0\big)$ and consider the terms λ_k such that $\mathrm{dist}\big(\lambda_k, \cup_{j=0}^{\infty}\{\Lambda_j\}\big)$ is small enough, then we can claim thanks to the bound (5.10) that

$$\sum_k \mathrm{dist}\big(\lambda_k, \cup_{j=0}^{\infty}\{\Lambda_j\}\big)^{\frac{p}{2}+1+\varepsilon+(\frac{p}{4}-1+\varepsilon)_+} < \infty. \tag{5.13}$$

Consequently, bounds (5.12) and (5.13) imply that such complex eigenvalues λ_k of the operator $\mathbb{P}$ accumulate more near the Landau levels than elsewhere near it's essential spectrum.

(iii) Similarly, we can also obtain information on diverging sequences of eigenvalues $(\lambda_k) \subset \sigma_{disc}(\mathbb{P})$. For example, if for some $\tau>0$ the sequence (λ_k) is such that

$$\mathrm{dist}\big(\lambda_k, [0,+\infty)\big) \geq \tau,$$

then one has that

$$\sum_{k=1}^{\infty} \frac{1}{|\lambda_k|^{\gamma}} < \infty, \tag{5.14}$$

with $\gamma > d+\frac{3}{2}$. This means that the sequence must converge to infinity sufficiently fast.

6. Proof of Theorem 5.1

In order to prove Theorem 1.1 and for more transparency in the presentation, let us progress following several steps.

6.1. **First step: estimate of the sandwiched resolvents of the operators $\mathbb{P}_0$ and $\mathbb{P}$.** Let $\mathbb{P}_\ell$, $\ell=1,2$ be the magnetic shifted Schrödinger operators defined in (5.1). Obviously, for any λ in the resolvent set of $\mathbb{P}_0$ we have

$$(\mathbb{P}_0-\lambda)^{-1} = \begin{pmatrix} (\mathbb{P}_1-\lambda)^{-1} & 0 \\ 0 & (\mathbb{P}_2-\lambda)^{-1} \end{pmatrix}. \tag{6.1}$$

Denote by p_j the orthogonal projection onto $\mathrm{Ker}\big(\mathbb{H}^-_{0,\perp}-\Lambda_j\big)$, where $\mathbb{H}^{\mp}_0$ are the shifted magnetic Schrödinger operators defined by (4.12) acting in $L^2(\mathbb{R}^{2d})$. Thanks to the decomposition $L^2(\mathbb{R}^{2d+1}) = L^2(\mathbb{R}^{2d})\otimes L^2(\mathbb{R})$, we have

$$(\mathbb{P}_1-\lambda)^{-1} = \sum_{j\in\mathbb{N}} p_j \otimes \Big(D_x^2+\Lambda_j-\lambda\Big)^{-1}, \quad (\mathbb{P}_2-\lambda)^{-1} = \sum_{j\in\mathbb{N}^*} p_{j-1} \otimes \Big(D_x^2+\Lambda_j-\lambda\Big)^{-1}. \tag{6.2}$$

Consequently, if the functions F and G satisfy assumption (5.6) and if we define

$$K_1 := \big(\|G\|_{L^2}+\|G\|_{L^\infty}\big)^p \int_{\mathbb{R}^{2d+1}} |F(\mathbf{x})|^p d\mathbf{x}, \tag{6.3}$$

then by [28, Lemma 3.1] for any $p \geq 2\big[\frac{d}{2}\big]+2$ we have

$$\big\|F(\mathbb{P}_\ell-\lambda)^{-1}G\big\|^p_{\mathcal{S}_p} \leq \frac{C(p)(1+|\lambda|)^{d+\frac{1}{2}}K_1}{\mathrm{dist}\big(\lambda,[0,+\infty)\big)^{\frac{p}{2}}\,\mathrm{dist}\big(\lambda,\cup_{j=0}^{\infty}\{\Lambda_j\}\big)^{\frac{p}{4}}}, \quad \ell=1,2. \tag{6.4}$$

Remarks.

In comparison with [28, Lemma 3.1], our constant $C(p)$ does not depend on the strength b of the magnetic field and d. This dependence is killed here by the fact that $\mathbb{P}_0$ is a shifted Pauli operator.

Thus we have the following lemma:

Lemma 6.1. *Let $d \geq 1$ and $\lambda \in \mathbb{C} \setminus [0, +\infty)$. Assume that $F \in L^p\big(\mathbb{R}^{2d+1}\big)$ with $p \geq 2\big[\frac{d}{2}\big] + 2$ and $G \in \big(L^2 \cap L^\infty\big)\big(\mathbb{R}\big)$. There exists a constant $C = C(p)$ such that*

$$\big\|F(\mathbb{P}_0 - \lambda)^{-1}G\big\|_{\mathcal{S}_p}^p \leq \frac{C(1+|\lambda|)^{d+\frac{1}{2}}K_1}{\mathrm{dist}\big(\lambda, [0,+\infty)\big)^{\frac{p}{2}}\,\mathrm{dist}\big(\lambda, \cup_{j=0}^{\infty}\{\Lambda_j\}\big)^{\frac{p}{4}}}, \tag{6.5}$$

where Λ_j are the Landau levels defined by (5.3) *and K_1 by* (6.3).

Note that since the potential V is bounded, then the numerical range of the operator $\mathbb{P}$ satisfies

$$\sigma(\mathbb{P}) \subset \overline{N(\mathbb{P})} \subset \big\{\lambda \in \mathbb{C} :\ \Re(\lambda) \geq -2\|V\|_\infty \ \text{ and } \ |\Im(\lambda)| \leq 2\|V\|_\infty\big\}. \tag{6.6}$$

For further use, we introduce the following technical condition. Namely, we consider λ_0 satisfying

$$\min\Big(|\Im(\lambda_0)|, \mathrm{dist}\big(\lambda_0, \overline{N(\mathbb{P})}\big)\Big) \geq 1 + 2\|V\|_\infty, \tag{6.7}$$

where $\mathbb{P}$ is the perturbed operator defined by (5.4).

We have the following lemma:

Lemma 6.2. *Assume that λ_0 satisfies condition* (6.7). *Under the assumptions of Lemma 6.1, there exists a constant $C = C(p)$ such that*

$$\big\|F(\mathbb{P} - \lambda_0)^{-1}G\big\|_{\mathcal{S}_p}^p \leq C(1+|\lambda_0|)^{d+\frac{1}{2}}K_2, \tag{6.8}$$

where the constant K_2 is defined by

$$K_2 := \|G\|_{L^\infty}^p \int_{\mathbb{R}^{2d+1}} |F(\mathbf{x})|^p d\mathbf{x}. \tag{6.9}$$

Proof. The identity $\big(\mathbb{P} - \lambda_0\big)^{-1} = \big(\mathbb{P}_0 - \lambda_0\big)^{-1}\big(\mathbb{P}_0 - \lambda_0\big)\big(\mathbb{P} - \lambda_0\big)^{-1}$ implies that

$$\begin{aligned}\Big\|F\big(\mathbb{P} - \lambda_0\big)^{-1}G\Big\|_{\mathcal{S}_p}^p &\leq \Big\|F\big(\mathbb{P} - \lambda_0\big)^{-1}\Big\|_{\mathcal{S}_p}^p \|G\|_{L^\infty}^p \\ &\leq \Big\|F\big(\mathbb{P}_0 - \lambda_0\big)^{-1}\Big\|_{\mathcal{S}_p}^p \Big\|\big(\mathbb{P}_0 - \lambda_0\big)\big(\mathbb{P} - \lambda_0\big)^{-1}\Big\|^p \|G\|_{L^\infty}^p.\end{aligned} \tag{6.10}$$

Arguing similarly to the proof of Lemma 6.1, we can show that

$$\Big\|F\big(\mathbb{P}_0 - \lambda_0\big)^{-1}\Big\|_{\mathcal{S}_p}^p \leq \frac{C\big(1+|\lambda_0|\big)^{d+\frac{1}{2}}}{|\Im(\lambda_0)|^p} \int_{\mathbb{R}^{2d+1}} |F(\mathbf{x})|^p d\mathbf{x}. \tag{6.11}$$

This together with condition (6.7) on λ_0 imply that

$$\Big\|F\big(\mathbb{P}_0 - \lambda_0\big)^{-1}\Big\|_{\mathcal{S}_p}^p \leq C\big(1+|\lambda_0|\big)^{d+\frac{1}{2}} \int_{\mathbb{R}^{2d+1}} |F(\mathbf{x})|^p d\mathbf{x}. \tag{6.12}$$

On the other hand, because we have

$$\Big\|\big(\mathbb{P}_0 - \lambda_0\big)\big(\mathbb{P} - \lambda_0\big)^{-1}\Big\| = \Big\|I - V\big(\mathbb{P} - \lambda_0\big)^{-1}\Big\| \leq 1 + 2\|V\|_\infty \Big\|\big(\mathbb{P} - \lambda_0\big)^{-1}\Big\|,$$

and by [2, Lemma 9.3.14]

$$\Big\|\big(\mathbb{P} - \lambda_0\big)^{-1}\Big\| \leq \frac{1}{\mathrm{dist}\big(\lambda_0, \overline{N(\mathbb{P})}\big)},$$

then thanks to condition (6.7) on λ_0,

$$\Big\|\big(\mathbb{P}_0 - \lambda_0\big)\big(\mathbb{P} - \lambda_0\big)^{-1}\Big\| \leq 2. \tag{6.13}$$

Lemma 6.2 follows by combining (6.10), (6.12) and (6.13). □

6.2. **Second step: first reduction of the problem.** In this subsection, we operate the first reduction of the study of the discrete eigenvalues by introducing a holomorphic function $f : \mathbb{C} \setminus [\Lambda_0, +\infty) \to \mathbb{C}$ whose zeros coincide with the discrete eigenvalues of the perturbed operator $\mathbb{P}$.

Let $T(\lambda) := V\big(\mathbb{P}_0 - \lambda\big)^{-1}$ with $\lambda \in \mathbb{C} \setminus [\Lambda_0, +\infty)$. Thanks to assumption (5.6) on the electric potential V, there exists is a bounded operator $\mathcal{V}$ such that for any $\mathbf{x} = (X_\perp, x) \in \mathbb{R}^{2d+1}$, we have $V(\mathbf{x}) = \mathcal{V}F(\mathbf{x})G(x)$. Hence, similarly to the proof of Lemma 6.1, we can show that $T(\lambda) \in \mathcal{S}_p$ for any $p \geq 2\big\lceil \frac{d}{2} \big\rceil + 2$. Consequently, we can introduce the regularized determinant $\det_{\lceil p \rceil}\big(I + T(\lambda)\big)$ defined by

$$\det_{\lceil p \rceil}\big(I + T(\lambda)\big) := \prod_{\mu \in \sigma\left(T(\lambda)\right)} \left[(1+\mu) \exp\left(\sum_{k=1}^{\lceil p \rceil - 1} \frac{(-\mu)^k}{k} \right) \right], \tag{6.14}$$

where $\lceil p \rceil := \min\big\{ n \in \mathbb{N} : n \geq p \big\}$. The following characterisation on the discrete eigenvalues is well known $\big($see e.g. [30, Chapter 9]$\big)$:

$$\lambda \in \sigma_{disc}(\mathbb{P}) \Leftrightarrow \det_{\lceil p \rceil}\big(I + T(\lambda)\big) = 0. \tag{6.15}$$

So, by setting

$$f(\lambda) := \det_{\lceil p \rceil}\big(I + T(\lambda)\big), \tag{6.16}$$

f is a holomorphic function on $\mathbb{C} \setminus [\Lambda_0, +\infty)$ and we have

$$\sigma_{disc}(\mathbb{P}) = \big\{ \lambda \in \mathbb{C} \setminus [\Lambda_0, +\infty) : f(\lambda) = 0 \big\}. \tag{6.17}$$

Furthermore, the algebraic multiplicity of λ as a discrete eigenvalue of the operator $\mathbb{P}$ is equal to the order of λ as a zero of the function f.

We have the following lemma:

Lemma 6.3. *Let $\lambda \in \mathbb{C} \setminus [\Lambda_0, +\infty)$ and assume that λ_0 verifies* (6.7)*. Under the assumptions of Lemma 6.1, there exists a constant $C = C(p)$ such that*

$$\log \left| \frac{f(\lambda)}{f(\lambda_0)} \right| \leq \frac{\Gamma_p C \big(1 + |\lambda|\big)^{d+\frac{1}{2}} K_1}{\operatorname{dist}\big(\lambda, [\Lambda_0, +\infty)\big)^{\frac{p}{2}} \operatorname{dist}\big(\lambda, \cup_{j=0}^{\infty} \{\Lambda_j\}\big)^{\frac{p}{4}}} + \Gamma_p C \big(1 + |\lambda_0|\big)^{d+\frac{1}{2}} K_1, \tag{6.18}$$

where Γ_p is some positive constant and K_1 is defined by (6.3)*.*

Proof. Because we have $f(\lambda_0)^{-1} = \det_{\lceil p \rceil}\Big(I + V(\mathbb{P}_0 - \lambda_0)^{-1}\Big)^{-1}$, then with the help of the identity $\big(\mathbb{P} - \lambda\big)\big(\mathbb{P}_0 - \lambda\big)^{-1} = I + V\big(\mathbb{P}_0 - \lambda\big)^{-1}$ we get $f(\lambda_0)^{-1} = \det_{\lceil p \rceil}\Big(I - V\big(\mathbb{P} - \lambda_0\big)^{-1}\Big)$. Thus

$$\begin{aligned} \left| \frac{f(\lambda)}{f(\lambda_0)} \right| &= \left| \det_{\lceil p \rceil}\Big(I + V\big(\mathbb{P}_0 - \lambda\big)^{-1}\Big) \right| \cdot \left| \det_{\lceil p \rceil}\Big(I - V\big(\mathbb{P} - \lambda_0\big)^{-1}\Big) \right| \\ &= \left| \det_{\lceil p \rceil}\Big(I + \mathcal{V}F\big(\mathbb{P}_0 - \lambda\big)^{-1} G\Big) \right| \cdot \left| \det_{\lceil p \rceil}\Big(I - \mathcal{V}F\big(\mathbb{P} - \lambda_0\big)^{-1} G\Big) \right|. \end{aligned} \tag{6.19}$$

On the other hand, for any $A \in \mathcal{S}_p$, the following bound holds $\big($see e.g. [30]$\big)$: $\big|\det_{\lceil p \rceil}(I+A)\big| \leq \mathrm{e}^{\Gamma_p \|A\|_{\mathcal{S}_p}^p}$. This together with (6.19) imply that

$$\left|\frac{f(\lambda)}{f(\lambda_0)}\right| \leq \mathrm{e}^{C\Gamma_p\left(\|F(\mathbb{P}_0-\lambda)^{-1}G\|_{\mathcal{S}_p}^p+\|F(\mathbb{P}-\lambda_0)^{-1}G\|_{\mathcal{S}_p}^p\right)}. \tag{6.20}$$

Consequently, Lemma 6.3 follows by combining Lemma 6.1 and Lemma 6.2, and using the inequality $K_2 < K_1$. □

6.3. **Third step: second reduction of the problem.** In this subsection, we reduce the study of the zeros of the function f in $\mathbb{C} \setminus [\Lambda_0, +\infty)$ to the study of zeros of holomorphic functions in the unit disk $\mathbb{D} := \big\{z \in \mathbb{C} : |z| < 1\big\}$. We will use a local approach, namely by considering the discrete eigenvalues around a fixed Landau level Λ_j, $j \in \mathbb{N}^*$. The upper and lower half planes will be denoted by $\mathbb{C}^+$ and $\mathbb{C}_-$ respectively.

Remarks.

(i) We focus on the case of $\lambda \in \sigma_{disc}(\mathbb{P}) \cap \mathbb{C}^+$, the same remains valid for $\lambda \in \sigma_{disc}(\mathbb{P}) \cap \mathbb{C}_-$ by considering rectangles Π_j in the lower half plane $\mathbb{C}_-$ (see Figure 6.1 below).

(ii) For simplicity in what follows below, by λ_0 we mean $\lambda_{0,j} \in \Pi_j$ and we suppose additionally that it verifies condition (6.7).



FIGURE 6.1. Rectangle Π_j in the upper half-plane $\mathbb{C}^+$ and containing Λ_j as the only Landau levels. The sectors S_k, $1 \leq k \leq 4$, form a partition of the rectangle Π_j.

According to Subsection 7.1 in the Appendix, we have $\varphi_j(1) = \Lambda_j$ and $\varphi_j(0) = \lambda_0$, $\varphi_j : \mathbb{D} \to \Pi_j$ being the conformal map defined by (7.1) by Christoffel-Schwarz formula with respect to the rectangle Π_j.

Consider f the function defined by (6.16) and introduce the function $h_j : \mathbb{D} \to \mathbb{C}$ as follows:

$$h_j(z) := f(\varphi_j(z)) \quad \text{and} \quad \tilde{h}_j(z) := \frac{h_j(z)}{h_j(0)}. \tag{6.21}$$

Then $\tilde{h}_j$ is a holomorphic function in the unit disk and thanks to (6.17), we have

$$\sigma_{disc}(\mathbb{P}) \cap \Pi_j = \big\{\varphi_j(z) \in \Pi_j : z \in \mathbb{D} : \tilde{h}_j(z) = 0\big\}. \tag{6.22}$$

We have the following lemma:

Lemma 6.4. *Let $\mathbb{T} := \partial\mathbb{D}$ be the boundary of the unit disk $\mathbb{D}$. Under the assumptions of Lemma 6.3, we have for any $z \in \mathbb{D}$ the bound*

$$\log\left|\tilde{h}_j(z)\right| \leq \frac{C(p,b,d,j)K_3}{\operatorname{dist}\big(z,\mathbb{T}\big)^{\frac{p}{2}}\,|z-1|^{\frac{p}{4}}}, \tag{6.23}$$

with the constant $C(p,b,d,j)$ satisfying the asymptotic property

$$C(p,b,d,j) \underset{j\to\infty}{\sim} j^{d+\frac{1}{2}}, \tag{6.24}$$

and the constant K_3 is defined by

$$K_3 := \big(\|G\|_{L^2} + \|G\|_{L^\infty}\big)^p \big(1+\|V\|_\infty\big)^{d+\frac{1}{2}} \int_{\mathbb{R}^{2d+1}} |F(\mathbf{x})|^p d\mathbf{x}. \tag{6.25}$$

Proof. Let K_1 be the constant defined by (6.3). Then for λ, $\lambda_0 = \lambda_{0,j} \in \Pi_j$ and λ_0 verifying condition (6.7), we have

$$\begin{aligned}
&\frac{\Gamma_p C(p) K_1\big(1+|\lambda|\big)^{d+\frac{1}{2}}}{\operatorname{dist}\big(\lambda,[\Lambda_0,+\infty)\big)^{\frac{p}{2}}\operatorname{dist}\big(\lambda,\cup_{j=0}^{\infty}\{\Lambda_j\}\big)^{\frac{p}{4}}} + \Gamma_p C(p) K_1\big(1+|\lambda_0|\big)^{d+\frac{1}{2}} \\
&\leq \frac{\Gamma_p C(p,b,d) K_3 (1+j)^{d+\frac{1}{2}}}{\operatorname{dist}\big(\lambda,\mathcal{L}_{1,\lambda}\big)^{\frac{p}{2}}\,|\lambda-\Lambda_j|^{\frac{p}{4}}} + \Gamma_p C(p,b,d) K_3 (1+j)^{d+\frac{1}{2}}.
\end{aligned} \tag{6.26}$$

Because we have $\varphi_j(z) = \lambda$ and $\varphi_j(1) = \Lambda_j$, then exploiting (7.2) (or Lemma 7.1) we obtain

$$\begin{aligned}
\frac{\Gamma_p C(p,b,d) K_3 (1+j)^{d+\frac{1}{2}}}{\operatorname{dist}\big(\lambda,\mathcal{L}_{1,\lambda}\big)^{\frac{p}{2}}\,|\lambda-\Lambda_j|^{\frac{p}{4}}} &\simeq \frac{C(p,b,d,j)K_3 \operatorname{dist}\big(z,\{z_1,z_4\}\big)^{\frac{p}{4}}}{\operatorname{dist}\big(z,\mathbb{T}\big)^{\frac{p}{2}}\,|z-1|^{\frac{p}{4}}} \\
&\leq \frac{C(p,b,d,j)K_3}{\operatorname{dist}\big(z,\mathbb{T}\big)^{\frac{p}{2}}\,|z-1|^{\frac{p}{4}}}.
\end{aligned}$$

Then this together with (6.26) give

$$\begin{aligned}
&\frac{\Gamma_p C(p) K_1\big(1+|\lambda|\big)^{d+\frac{1}{2}}}{\operatorname{dist}\big(\lambda,[\Lambda_0,+\infty)\big)^{\frac{p}{2}}\operatorname{dist}\big(\lambda,\cup_{j=0}^{\infty}\{\Lambda_j\}\big)^{\frac{p}{4}}} + \Gamma_p C(p) K_1\big(1+|\lambda_0|\big)^{d+\frac{1}{2}} \\
&\leq \frac{C(p,b,d,j)K_3}{\operatorname{dist}\big(z,\mathbb{T}\big)^{\frac{p}{2}}\,|z-1|^{\frac{p}{4}}} + C(p,b,d,j)K_3 \leq \frac{C(p,b,d,j)K_3}{\operatorname{dist}\big(z,\mathbb{T}\big)^{\frac{p}{2}}\,|z-1|^{\frac{p}{4}}}
\end{aligned} \tag{6.27}$$

for any $\lambda \in \Pi_j$. Consequently, Lemma 6.4 follows by combining Lemma 6.3, (6.21) and (6.27). □

6.4. **Fourth step: local bound on the discrete eigenvalues.** Let us apply the Borichev-Golinskii-Kupin Theorem 7.1 with the function $\tilde{h}_j$ of Lemma 6.4. This gives for any $0 < \varepsilon < 1$

$$\sum_{\{\tilde{h}_j(z)=0\}} \operatorname{dist}\big(z,\mathbb{T}\big)^{\frac{p}{2}+1+\varepsilon} |z-1|^{(\frac{p}{4}-1+\varepsilon)_+} \leq C(p,b,d,j,\varepsilon)K_3. \tag{6.28}$$

Thanks to Lemma 7.1, in the rectangle Π_j we can write bound (6.28) as

$$\sum_{\lambda\in\sigma_{disc}(\mathbb{P})\cap\Pi_j} \Big(\operatorname{dist}\big(\lambda,\partial\Pi_j\big)\operatorname{dist}\big(\lambda,\mathcal{F}_\lambda\big)\Big)^{\frac{p}{2}+1+\varepsilon} |\lambda-\Lambda_j|^{(\frac{p}{4}-1+\varepsilon)_+} \leq C(p,b,d,j,\varepsilon)K_3, \tag{6.29}$$

the constant $C(p,b,d,j,\varepsilon)$ verifying the asymptotic property (6.24).

In the sequel, the aim is to estimate the sum

$$\sum_{\lambda\in\sigma_{disc}(\mathbb{P})\cap\Pi_j} \operatorname{dist}\big(\lambda,[\Lambda_0,+\infty)\big)^{\frac{p}{2}+1+\varepsilon}\operatorname{dist}\big(\lambda,\cup_{j=0}^{\infty}\{\Lambda_j\}\big)^{(\frac{p}{4}-1+\varepsilon)_+} \tag{6.30}$$

exploiting (6.29). To this end, for any rectangle Π_j, we will work with its magnified version Π_j' in the horizontal direction (see Figure 6.2 below) where the constant δ is such that $0<\delta<b$.



FIGURE 6.2. Magnified versions Π_j' and Π_{j+1}' respectively of disjoint rectangles Π_j and Π_{j+1} in the upper half-plane $\mathbb{C}^+$.

This yields to the following lemma:

Lemma 6.5. *For any $j\geq 0$, we have the following bound*

$$\sum_{\lambda\in\sigma_{disc}(\mathbb{P})\cap\Pi_j} \operatorname{dist}\big(\lambda,[\Lambda_0,+\infty)\big)^{\frac{p}{2}+1+\varepsilon}\operatorname{dist}\big(\lambda,\cup_{j=0}^{\infty}\{\Lambda_j\}\big)^{(\frac{p}{4}-1+\varepsilon)_+} \leq C(p,b,d,j,\varepsilon)K \tag{6.31}$$

K being the constant defined by (5.9)*, and the constant $C(p,b,d,j,\varepsilon)$ satisfies the asymptotic property* (6.24).

Proof. In figure 6.2 above, the sectors S_k', $1\leq k\leq 4$ form a partition of the rectangle Π_j'. Estimate (6.29) applied to the rectangle Π_j' gives

$$\sum_{\lambda\in\sigma_{disc}(\mathbb{P})\cap\Pi_j'} \Big(\operatorname{dist}\big(\lambda,\partial\Pi_j'\big)\operatorname{dist}\big(\lambda,\mathcal{F}_{\lambda'}\big)\Big)^{\frac{p}{2}+1+\varepsilon}|\lambda-\Lambda_j|^{(\frac{p}{4}-1+\varepsilon)_+} \leq C(p,b,d,j,\varepsilon)K_3.$$

Because we have $\Pi_j\subset\Pi_j'$, then on Π_j this yields to

$$\sum_{\lambda\in\sigma_{disc}(\mathbb{P})\cap\Pi_j} \Big(\operatorname{dist}\big(\lambda,\partial\Pi_j'\big)\operatorname{dist}\big(\lambda,\mathcal{F}_{\lambda'}\big)\Big)^{\frac{p}{2}+1+\varepsilon}|\lambda-\Lambda_j|^{(\frac{p}{4}-1+\varepsilon)_+} \leq C(p,b,d,j,\varepsilon)K_3. \tag{6.32}$$

On the other hand, thanks to (6.6), there is no discrete eigenvalues in the sector S_3'. Thus we have

$$\begin{aligned}\sum_{\lambda\in\sigma_{disc}(\mathbb{P})\cap\Pi_j}&\Big(\operatorname{dist}\big(\lambda,\partial\Pi_j'\big)\operatorname{dist}\big(\lambda,\mathcal{F}_{\lambda'}\big)\Big)^{\frac{p}{2}+1+\varepsilon}|\lambda-\Lambda_j|^{(\frac{p}{4}-1+\varepsilon)_+}=\\ &\sum_{\lambda\in\sigma_{disc}(\mathbb{P})\cap\Pi_j\cap S_1'}\Big(\operatorname{dist}\big(\lambda,\mathcal{L}_{1,\lambda}'\big)\operatorname{dist}\big(\lambda,\{\lambda_1',\lambda_4'\}\big)\Big)^{\frac{p}{2}+1+\varepsilon}|\lambda-\Lambda_j|^{(\frac{p}{4}-1+\varepsilon)_+}\\ &+\sum_{\lambda\in\sigma_{disc}(\mathbb{P})\cap\Pi_j\cap S_2'}\Big(\operatorname{dist}\big(\lambda,\mathcal{L}_{2,\lambda}'\big)\operatorname{dist}\big(\lambda,\{\lambda_4',\lambda_3'\}\big)\Big)^{\frac{p}{2}+1+\varepsilon}|\lambda-\Lambda_j|^{(\frac{p}{4}-1+\varepsilon)_+}\\ &+\sum_{\lambda\in\sigma_{disc}(\mathbb{P})\cap\Pi_j\cap S_4'}\Big(\operatorname{dist}\big(\lambda,\mathcal{L}_{4,\lambda}'\big)\operatorname{dist}\big(\lambda,\{\lambda_2',\lambda_1'\}\big)\Big)^{\frac{p}{2}+1+\varepsilon}|\lambda-\Lambda_j|^{(\frac{p}{4}-1+\varepsilon)_+}.\end{aligned}\tag{6.33}$$

Then from (6.32), we derive in particular that

$$\begin{aligned}\sum_{\lambda\in\sigma_d(\mathbb{P})\cap\Pi_j\cap S_2'}&\Big(\operatorname{dist}\big(\lambda,\mathcal{L}_{2,\lambda}'\big)\operatorname{dist}\big(\lambda,\{\lambda_4',\lambda_3'\}\big)\Big)^{\frac{p}{2}+1+\varepsilon}|\lambda-\Lambda_j|^{(\frac{p}{4}-1+\varepsilon)_+}\\ &\le C(p,b,d,j,\varepsilon)K_3,\\ \sum_{\lambda\in\sigma_d(\mathbb{P})\cap\Pi_j\cap S_4'}&\Big(\operatorname{dist}\big(\lambda,\mathcal{L}_{4,\lambda}'\big)\operatorname{dist}\big(\lambda,\{\lambda_2',\lambda_1'\}\big)\Big)^{\frac{p}{2}+1+\varepsilon}|\lambda-\Lambda_j|^{(\frac{p}{4}-1+\varepsilon)_+}\\ &\le C(p,b,d,j,\varepsilon)K_3.\end{aligned}\tag{6.34}$$

Recall that we want to bound the sum (6.30) to get Lemma 6.5. Thanks to the non-existence of discrete eigenvalues in the sector S_3', as in (6.33) the sum (6.30) can be decomposed as

$$\begin{aligned}\sum_{\lambda\in\sigma_d(\mathbb{P})\cap\Pi_j}&\operatorname{dist}\big(\lambda,\mathcal{L}_{1,\lambda}\big)^{\frac{p}{2}+1+\varepsilon}|\lambda-\Lambda_j|^{(\frac{p}{4}-1+\varepsilon)_+}=\\ &\sum_{\lambda\in\sigma_d(\mathbb{P})\cap\Pi_j\cap S_1'}\operatorname{dist}\big(\lambda,\mathcal{L}_{1,\lambda}\big)^{\frac{p}{2}+1+\varepsilon}|\lambda-\Lambda_j|^{(\frac{p}{4}-1+\varepsilon)_+}\\ &+\sum_{\lambda\in\sigma_d(\mathbb{P})\cap\Pi_j\cap S_2'}\operatorname{dist}\big(\lambda,\mathcal{L}_{1,\lambda}\big)^{\frac{p}{2}+1+\varepsilon}|\lambda-\Lambda_j|^{(\frac{p}{4}-1+\varepsilon)_+}\\ &+\sum_{\lambda\in\sigma_d(\mathbb{P})\cap\Pi_j\cap S_4'}\operatorname{dist}\big(\lambda,\mathcal{L}_{1,\lambda}\big)^{\frac{p}{2}+1+\varepsilon}|\lambda-\Lambda_j|^{(\frac{p}{4}-1+\varepsilon)_+}.\end{aligned}\tag{6.35}$$

Let us combine (6.32) and (6.33) and focus in the first sum of the right hand side of (6.33). Then by exploiting the lower bound $\operatorname{dist}\big(\lambda,\{\lambda_1',\lambda_4'\}\big)\ge\delta$ for any $\lambda\in\sigma_{disc}(\mathbb{P})\cap\Pi_j\cap S_1'$, it can be easily checked that

$$\sum_{\lambda\in\sigma_{disc}(\mathbb{P})\cap\Pi_j\cap S_1'}\operatorname{dist}\big(\lambda,\mathcal{L}_{1,\lambda}\big)^{\frac{p}{2}+1+\varepsilon}|\lambda-\Lambda_j|^{(\frac{p}{4}-1+\varepsilon)_+}\le\frac{C(p,b,d,j,\varepsilon)K_3}{\delta^{\frac{p}{2}+1+\varepsilon}}.\tag{6.36}$$

On the other hand, for any $\lambda \in \sigma_{disc}(\mathbb{P}) \cap \Pi_j \cap S_2'$, we can easily remark that $\text{dist}\big(\lambda, \mathcal{L}_{1,\lambda}\big) \leq 2\|V\|_\infty$ and $\text{dist}\big(\lambda, \mathcal{L}'_{2,\lambda}\big)\,\text{dist}\big(\lambda, \{\lambda'_4, \lambda'_3\}\big) \geq \delta^2$. Consequently, we have

$$\begin{aligned}&\sum_{\lambda\in\sigma_{disc}(\mathbb{P})\cap\Pi_j\cap S_2'} \text{dist}\big(\lambda, \mathcal{L}_{1,\lambda}\big)^{\frac{p}{2}+1+\varepsilon}|\lambda-\Lambda_j|^{(\frac{p}{4}-1+\varepsilon)_+}\\ &\leq \frac{\big(2\|V\|_\infty\big)^{\frac{p}{2}+1+\varepsilon}}{\delta^{2(\frac{p}{2}+1+\varepsilon)}} \sum_{\lambda\in\sigma_d(\mathbb{P})\cap\Pi_j\cap S_2'} \Big(\text{dist}\big(\lambda, \mathcal{L}'_{2,\lambda}\big)\,\text{dist}\big(\lambda, \{\lambda'_4, \lambda'_3\}\big)\Big)^{\frac{p}{2}+1+\varepsilon}|\lambda-\Lambda_j|^{(\frac{p}{4}-1+\varepsilon)_+}.\end{aligned}$$

This together with (6.34) yields to

$$\sum_{\lambda\in\sigma_{disc}(\mathbb{P})\cap\Pi_j\cap S_2'} \text{dist}\big(\lambda, \mathcal{L}_{1,\lambda}\big)^{\frac{p}{2}+1+\varepsilon}|\lambda-\Lambda_j|^{(\frac{p}{4}-1+\varepsilon)_+} \leq C(p,b,d,j,\varepsilon)K, \tag{6.37}$$

the constant K being defined by (5.9).

Arguing similarly, we arrive to the bound

$$\sum_{\lambda\in\sigma_{disc}(\mathbb{P})\cap\Pi_j\cap S_4'} \text{dist}\big(\lambda, \mathcal{L}_{1,\lambda}\big)^{\frac{p}{2}+1+\varepsilon}|\lambda-\Lambda_j|^{(\frac{p}{4}-1+\varepsilon)_+} \leq C(p,b,d,j,\varepsilon)K. \tag{6.38}$$

For the rectangle Π_0 containing the first Landau level $\Lambda_0 = 0$, the vertice λ_1 of the edge $\mathcal{L}_{4,\lambda}$ must satisfy $\lambda_1 \leq -2\|V\|_\infty$. Combining estimates (6.35)-(6.38), we obtain that for any $j \geq 0$,

$$\sum_{\lambda\in\sigma_{disc}(\mathbb{P})\cap\Pi_j} \text{dist}\big(\lambda, \mathcal{L}_{1,\lambda}\big)^{\frac{p}{2}+1+\varepsilon}|\lambda-\Lambda_j|^{(\frac{p}{4}-1+\varepsilon)_+} \leq C(p,b,d,j,\varepsilon)K. \tag{6.39}$$

This concludes the proof of the Lemma. □

6.5. **Fifth step: global bound on the discrete eigenvalues.** This is the last step of the proof of Theorem 1.1. As it was mentioned in the remarks of Subsection 6.3, Lemma 6.5 remains valid for rectangle Π_j lying in the lower half plane $\mathbb{C}_-$. Then without any loss of generality, we can consider a rectangle

$$\widehat{\Pi}_j := \big\{\lambda \in \mathbb{C} : |\Lambda_j - \Re(\lambda)| \leq b \ \text{ and } \ |\Im(\lambda)| \leq 2\|V\|_\infty\big\}$$

around a Landau level Λ_j and claim that we have

$$\sum_{\lambda\in\sigma_{disc}(\mathbb{P})\cap\widehat{\Pi}_j} \text{dist}\big(\lambda, [\Lambda_0, +\infty)\big)^{\frac{p}{2}+1+\varepsilon}\,\text{dist}\big(\lambda, \cup_{j=0}^\infty\{\Lambda_j\}\big)^{(\frac{p}{4}-1+\varepsilon)_+} \leq C(p,b,d,j,\varepsilon)K, \tag{6.40}$$

with the asymptotic property $C(p,b,d,j,\varepsilon) \underset{j\to\infty}{\sim} j^{d+\frac{1}{2}}$. We get the global bound summing up bounds (6.40) with appropriate weights as follows,

$$\begin{aligned}\sum_j \frac{1}{(1+j)^\gamma} &\sum_{\lambda\in\sigma_{disc}(\mathbb{P})\cap\widehat{\Pi}_j} \text{dist}\big(\lambda, [\Lambda_0, +\infty)\big)^{\frac{p}{2}+1+\varepsilon}\,\text{dist}\big(\lambda, \cup_{j=0}^\infty\{\Lambda_j\}\big)^{(\frac{p}{4}-1+\varepsilon)_+}\\ &\leq \sum_j \frac{C(p,b,d,j,\varepsilon)}{(1+j)^\gamma}K.\end{aligned}$$

Now, choosing γ such that $\gamma > d + \frac{3}{2}$ and using the fact that for any $\lambda \in \widehat{\Pi}_j$ we have $1 + j \simeq 1 + |\lambda|$, we obtain Theorem 5.1.

7. APPENDIX

This appendix is devoted to the recall of complex analysis tools we need in the second part of the article, like the Christoffel-Schwarz formula [15, Theorem 1, p. 176] and the Borichev-Golinskii-Kupin Theorem [1]. As usual, $\mathbb{C}^+$ and $\mathbb{C}_-$ are the upper and lower half planes respectively.

7.1. **Schwarz-Christoffel formula.** Consider $\Pi = \mathcal{R}(\lambda_1, \lambda_2, \lambda_3, \lambda_4)$ a rectangle (or a square) with vertices λ_1, $\lambda_4 \in \mathbb{R}$, and λ_2, $\lambda_3 \in \mathbb{C}^+$ or λ_2, $\lambda_3 \in \mathbb{C}_-$ (see Figure 7.1 below). It is well known, see e.g. [15, Theorem 1, p. 176] that there exists a conformal map $\varphi : \mathbb{D} \to \Pi$ given by the Christoffel-Schwarz formula. Let

$$\mathbb{T} := \partial\mathbb{D} = \big\{z \in \mathbb{C} : |z| = 1\big\}$$

be the boundary of the unit disk $\mathbb{D}$, and let $z_j \in \mathbb{T}$ be the points such that $\varphi(z_j) = \lambda_j$, for $1 \le j \le 4$. Due to the fact that Π is a rectangle (or a square), the map φ verifies

$$\varphi'(z) = \frac{C}{(z-z_1)^{\frac{1}{2}}(z-z_2)^{\frac{1}{2}}(z-z_3)^{\frac{1}{2}}(z-z_4)^{\frac{1}{2}}}, \tag{7.1}$$

C being a constant.



FIGURE 7.1. Transformation of the unit disk by the conformal map $\varphi(z) = \lambda$.

One has $\varphi\big(\mathcal{L}_{j,z}\big) = \mathcal{L}_{j,\lambda}$ and $\partial\Pi = \bigcup_j \mathcal{L}_{j,\lambda}$. We also put $\mathcal{F}_z := \big\{z_j\big\}_j$ and $\mathcal{F}_\lambda := \big\{\lambda_j\big\}_j$ so that $\varphi(\mathcal{F}_z) = \mathcal{F}_\lambda$. In the properties below, the relation $\simeq$ is defined as in (2.10).

Lemma 7.1. *The following holds for any $z \in \mathbb{D}$ and $\lambda \in \Pi$,*

$$\operatorname{dist}(\lambda, \partial\Pi) \simeq \operatorname{dist}(z, \mathbb{T}) \frac{1}{\operatorname{dist}(z, \mathcal{F}_z)^{\frac{1}{2}}},$$

or equivalently

$$\operatorname{dist}(z, \mathbb{T}) \simeq \operatorname{dist}(\lambda, \partial\Pi) \operatorname{dist}(\lambda, \mathcal{F}_\lambda).$$

Proof. It follows directly from [19, Corollary 1.4] and (2.10). □

In the proof of Theorem 5.1, the same quantities are investigated with $\operatorname{dist}(z, \mathbb{T})$ and $\operatorname{dist}(\lambda, \partial\Pi)$ replaced by $\operatorname{dist}\big(z, \mathcal{L}_{1,z}\big)$ and $\operatorname{dist}\big(\lambda, \mathcal{L}_{1,\lambda}\big)$, respectively. Similarly to Lemma 7.1, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \operatorname{dist}\big(\lambda, \mathcal{L}_{1,\lambda}\big) &\simeq \operatorname{dist}\big(z, \mathcal{L}_{1,z}\big) \frac{1}{\operatorname{dist}\big(z, \{z_1, z_4\}\big)^{\frac{1}{2}}}, \\ \operatorname{dist}\big(z, \mathcal{L}_{1,z}\big) &\simeq \operatorname{dist}\big(\lambda, \mathcal{L}_{1,\lambda}\big) \operatorname{dist}\big(\lambda, \{\lambda_1, \lambda_4\}\big). \end{aligned} \tag{7.2}$$

7.2. **A theorem by Borichev, Golinskii and Kupin.** The following result by A. Borichev, L. Golinskii and S. Kupin is proved in [1]. It provides a bound on zeros of holomorphic functions in the unit disk $\mathbb{D}$.

Theorem 7.1. *Let h be a holomorphic function in the unit disk $\mathbb{D}$ with $h(0) = 1$. Assume that h satisfies a bound of the form*

$$\log|h(z)| \leq K_0 \frac{1}{\big(1-|z|\big)^{\alpha}} \prod_{j=0}^{N} \frac{1}{|z-\xi_j|^{\beta_j}},$$

where $\xi_j \in \mathbb{T}$ and α, $\beta_j \geq 0$. Let $\tau > 0$. Then the zeros of h satisfy the inequality

$$\sum_{\{h(z)=0\}} \big(1-|z|\big)^{\alpha+1+\tau} \prod_{j=0}^{N} |z-\xi_j|^{(\beta_j-1+\tau)_+} \leq C\big(\alpha, \{\beta_j\}, \{\xi_j\}, \tau\big) K_0.$$

REFERENCES

[1] A. BORICHEV, L. GOLINSKII, S. KUPIN, *A Blaschke-type condition and its application to complex Jacobi matrices*, Bull. London Math. Soc. **41** (2009), 117-123.

[2] E. B. DAVIES, *Linear Operators and their Spectra*, Camb. Stu. Adv. Math. **106** (2007), Cambridge University Press.

[3] M. DEMUTH, M. HANSMANN, G. KATRIEL, *On the discrete spectrum of non-seladjoint operators*, J. Funct. Anal. **257**(9) (2009), 2742-2759.

[4] M. DIMASSI, G. D. RAIKOV, *Spectral asymptotics for quantum Hamiltonians in strong magnetic fields*, Cubo Math. Educ **3**(2) (2001), 317-391.

[5] C. DUBUISSON, *On quantitative bounds on eigenvalues of a complex perturbation of a Dirac operator*, Int. Eq. Operator Theory **78**(2) (2014), 249–269.

[6] R. L. FRANK, A. LAPTEV, E. H. LIEB, R. SEIRINGER, *Lieb-Thirring inequalities for Schrödinger operators with complex-valued potentials*, Lett. in Math. Phys. **77** (2006), 309-316.

[7] I. GOHBERG, S. GOLDBERG, M. A. KAASHOEK, *Classes of Linear Operators*, Operator Theory, Advances and Applications, vol. **49** Birkhäuser Verlag, 1990.

[8] I. GOHBERG, S. GOLDBERG, N. KRUPNIK, *Traces and Determinants of Linear Operators*, Operator Theory, Advances and Applications, vol. **116** Birkhäuser Verlag, 2000.

[9] L. GOLINSKII, S. KUPIN, *On discrete spectrum of complex perturbations of finite band Schrödinger operators*, in "Recent trends in Analysis", Proceedings of the conference in honor of N. Nikolsi, Université Bordeaux 1, 2011, Theta Foundation, Bucharest, Romania, 2013.

[10] M. HANSMANN, *Variation of discrete spectra for non-selfadjoint perturbations of selfadjoint operators*, Int. Eq. Op. Theory, **76**(2) (2013) 163-178.

[11] V. YA. IVRII, *Microlocal Analysis and Precise Spectral Asymptotics*, Springer-Verlag, Berlin, 1998.

[12] A. IWATSUKA, H. TAMURA, *Asymptotic distribution of eigenvalues for Pauli operators with nonconstant magnetic fields*, Duke Math. J. **93** (1998), 535-574.

[13] A. KACHMAR, M. PERSSON, *Remark on magnetic Schroedinger operators in exterior domains*, preprint on http://arxiv.org/abs/0907.1961.

[14] T. KATO, *Perturbation Theory for Linear Operators*, Springer-Verlag, Berlin, 1966.

[15] M. LAVRENTIEV, B. CHABAT, *Méthodes de la théorie des fonctions d'une variable complexe*, Éditions Mir, Moscou, 1977.

[16] E. H. LIEB, W. THIRRING, *Bound for the kinetic energy of fermions which proves the stability of matter*, Phys. Rev. lett. **35** (1975), 687-689. Errata **35** (1975), 1116.

[17] M. MELGAARD, G. ROZENBLUM *Eigenvalue asymptotics for weakly perturbed Dirac and Schröinger operators with constant magnetic fields of full rank*, Commun. PDE. **28** (2003), 697-736.

[18] M. PERSSON *Eigenvalue asymptotics for the even-dimensional exterior Landau-Neumann Hamiltonian*, Adv. Math. Phys. Volume 2009 (2009). Article ID 873704.

[19] CH. POMMERENKE, *Boundary Behavior of Conformal Maps*, Grund. Math. Wiss. **299** (1992), Springer-Verlag.

[20] A. PUSHNITSKI, G. D. RAIKOV, C. VILLEGAS-BLAS, *Asymptotic Density of Eigenvalue Clusters for the Perturbed Landau Hamiltonian*, Comm. Math. Phys. **320**(2) (2013) 425–453.

[21] A. PUSHNITSKI, G. ROZENBLUM, *Eigenvalue Clusters of the Landau Hamiltonian in the Exterior of a Compact Domain*, Documenta Math. **12** (2007), 569-586.
[22] G. D. RAIKOV, *Eigenvalue asymptotics for the Schrödinger operator with homogeneous magnetic potential and decreasing electric potential. I. Behaviour near the essential spectrum tips*, Commun. P.D.E. **15** (1990), 407-434.
[23] G. D. RAIKOV, *Border–line eigenvalue asymptotics for the Schrödinger operator with electromagnetic potential*, Int. Equat. Op. Theory **14** (1991), 875-888.
[24] G. D. RAIKOV, *Spectral asymptotics for the perturbed* $2D$ *Pauli Operator with oscillating magnetic Fields. I. Non-zero mean value of the magnetic field*, Markov Process. Related Fields **9** (2003), 775-794.
[25] G. D. RAIKOV, *Low Energy Asymptotics of the SSF for Pauli Operators with Nonconstant Fields*, Publ. RIMS Kyoto Univ. **46** (2010), 565-590.
[26] G. D. RAIKOV, S. WARZEL, *Quasi-classical versus non-classical spectral asymptotics for magnetic Schrödinger operators with decreasing electric potentials*, Rev. in Math. Physics, **14**(10) (2002) 1051-1072.
[27] M. REED, B. SIMON, *Scattering Theory III*, Methods of Modern Mathematical Physics, (1979), Academic Press, INC.
[28] D. SAMBOU, *Lieb-Thirring type inequalities for non self-adjoint perturbations of magnetic Schrödinger operators*, J. Funct. Anal. **266** (8), (2014), 5016-5044.
[29] D. SAMBOU, *On the existence of complex eigenvalues near the isolated essential spectrum*, submitted, preprint on http://arxiv.org/abs/1408.2109
[30] B. SIMON, *Trace ideals and their applications*, Lond. Math. Soc. Lect. Not. Series, **35** (1979), Cambridge University Press.
[31] A. V. SOBOLEV, *Asymptotic behavior of the energy levels of a quantum particle in a homogeneous magnetic field, perturbed by a decreasing electric field. I*, J. Sov. Math. **35** (1986), 2201-2212.
[32] H. TAMURA, *Asymptotic distribution of eigenvalues for Schrödinger operators with homogeneous magnetic fields*, Osaka J. Math, **25** (1988), 633-647.

FACULTAD DE MATEMÁTICAS PONTIFICIA UNIVERSIDAD CATÓLICA DE CHILE, AV. VICUNA MACKENNA 4860, SANTIAGO DE CHILE

E-mail address: disambou@mat.uc.cl